
Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation

Author(s): Albert Henrichs

Source: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 1973, Vol. 77 (1973), pp. 23-59

Published by: Department of the Classics, Harvard University

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/311059>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*

JSTOR

MANI AND THE BABYLONIAN BAPTISTS: A HISTORICAL CONFRONTATION

ALBERT HENRICHES

I

ONCE upon a time, when Mani visited Ctesiphon, the Sassanian capital, during one of his missionary journeys, he had to leave the congregation of his faithful because the King of Kings, Shapur I, had sent for him. He was called before the king two more times within short intervals. When Mani returned to his flock after the third audience, one of his disciples approached him with the following request:

This paper was delivered as a James C. Loeb Classical Lecture at Harvard University on December 2, 1971.

The following abbreviations have been used throughout:

<i>CMC</i>	The Cologne Mani Codex, a miniature parchment codex of the 5th century A.D. which provides new information on Mani's life in a baptist sect in southern Babylonia. Major portions of the Greek text are accessible in "Mani-Codex" (see below); the rest is unpublished. The references following <i>CMC</i> are to the pages and lines of the codex.
<i>Hom.</i>	<i>Manichäische Homilien</i> , herausgegeben von H. J. Polotsky. <i>Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty</i> , Band I (Stuttgart 1934).
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> .
<i>Keph.</i>	<i>Kephalaia</i> . <i>Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin</i> , Band I 1. Hälfte, ed. H. J. Polotsky und A. Böhlig (Stuttgart 1940); 2. Hälfte, ed. A. Böhlig (Stuttgart 1966).
"Mani-Codex"	A. Henriches and L. Koenen, "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)," <i>ZPE</i> 5 (1970) 97-216.
<i>Psalm-Book</i>	<i>A Manichaean Psalm-Book (Part II)</i> , edited by C. R. C. Allberry. <i>Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection</i> , vol. II (Stuttgart 1938).
<i>SPA W</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> , Philologisch-historische Klasse, Berlin.
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> .
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i> .

“Pray, Lord Mani, let us have two Manis after your likeness who come down as you did, one Mani to stay with us and another to go to Shapur.”¹

The passage is taken from the *Kephalaia*, a semicanonical collection of didactic sermons which as a genre has its immediate though less complex predecessors in Jewish, Gnostic, and Hermetic examples of wisdom literature.² Mani is portrayed as the wise religious teacher, always ready to give illuminating answers to the unpretentious questions of his disciples. No doubt the request for two Manis was put forward in all innocence and was prompted by the disciple's love for his spiritual father. But the very nature of this request marks the disciple as a green novice who had no clear understanding of the subtle theological issues that surrounded the mystery of Mani's incarnation. In terms of Manichaean soteriology, the notion of a duplicate Mani was, in fact, not at all unheard of, but was a well-established doctrine, propagated time and again by Mani himself.³ Mani's double, though his steady companion on earth, his counselor and helper in times of hardship, and his consoler in moments of despair, was not a creature of flesh and blood, but an incorporeal and celestial being, not subject to the terrestrial limitations of time and space. As the pre-existent and eternal Twin of Light, he is the mirror-like reflection of Mani's inner self, the heavenly embodiment of his spiritual essence, his true identity, from whom he was separated when his soul put on the garment of a mortal body and with whom he was reunited at his death.⁴ Up to this point, the underlying concept, far from being original, is well known as the classical Gnostic expression of *Selbstfindung*, which is the dominant theme in the Hymn of the Pearl, a composition of the early third century that

¹ *Keph.* 183,13–188,29. Cf. O. Klíma, *Mani's Zeit und Leben*. Monographien des Orientinstituts der Tschechoslowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 18 (Prag 1962) 335f; L. J. R. Ort, *Mani. A religio-historical description of his personality*. Supplementa ad *Numen*, Altera Series, I (Leiden 1967) 165–168 (Prospective readers of Ort's book should consult M. Boyce, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1968, 82–84).

² We lack a comprehensive study of the literary form of the *Kephalaia*. A valuable beginning has been made in several contributions by A. Böhlig, now conveniently assembled in *Mysterion und Wahrheit. Arbeiten zur Geschichte d. späteren Judentums u. d. Urchristentums*, 6 (Leiden 1968) 228–266; cf. K. Rudolph, “Der gnostische ‘Dialog’ als literarisches Genus,” *Probleme der koptischen Literatur*. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge d. Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg 1968, 85ff, esp. 92, 94, 102.

³ The evidence is collected and discussed in “Mani-Codex” 161–189.

⁴ Cf. “Mani-Codex” 162 n. 164, 164, 168f, 185; for *ἐνδύμα*, see below nn. 121, 128, 133.

was exploited by Mani.⁵ What is genuinely Manichaean is the way in which the concept of the Twin-Companion who brings personal salvation is, in the hierarchy of divine emanations, closely associated with the Apostle of Light. The latter is the god-sent messenger to the world and the herald of the redemption of mankind, who made his appearance in the Patriarchs of the Old Testament, in the religious leaders of the East, in Jesus and Paul, in Marcion and Bardaišan, and finally in Mani.⁶ But Mani is unique in that he was sent to the last generation in the consummation of time, thereby concluding the successive incarnations of the Apostle of Light.

In the eyes of the initiate, therefore, the mere suggestion of having two Manis descend from heaven and live in coexistence on earth, thus duplicating what was in reality an irreproducible compound in the divine plan of salvation,⁷ must have been sheer heresy. For a complete outsider, on the other hand, the idea of two Manis would have inevitably focused attention on Mani the human individual and would have implicitly questioned his claim to be a prophet by vocation.⁸ On both

⁵ H. Jones, *The Gnostic Religion* (2nd ed., Boston 1963) 112ff; "Mani-Codex" 171ff.

⁶ The key passages are *Keph.* 12,9ff and *Hom.* 68,15ff; M 299 a in W. B. Henning, "Ein manichäisches Henochbuch," *SPAW* 1934, V, 27f. See below, nn. 29, 111, 118.

⁷ In Manichaean theology, salvation, both individual and universal, follows the mythical pattern of the salvation of the First Man; cf. H.-Ch. Puech, "Der Begriff der Erlösung im Manichäismus," *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 4 (1936) 183–286 (= J. Campbell [ed.], *The Mystic Vision*, Bollingen Series 30.6 [Princeton, N.J., 1968] 247–314).

⁸ That Mani's revelations (see below, nn. 34–35) were a major stumbling-block for the opponents of his religion is shown by a long apologetic digression in homiletic form, probably by the hand of Baraies (on the latter see "Mani-Codex" 110), which covers some thirty pages of the *CMC* (pp. 45–72; cf. "Mani-Codex" 106ff). In the course of this digression, "historical" evidence from apocalyptic literature of heterodox Judaism (below, n. 29) and from St. Paul is produced in support of Mani's own visionary experiences. The author of this section is particularly concerned to find in his apocalyptic sources a pattern of dissemination which is identical with the transmission of Mani's revelations: The "forefathers" (*CMC* 47,4f *οἱ προγενέστεροι πατέρες*. Cf. *Keph.* 7,6f; M 7 in F. C. Andreas and W. B. Henning, *SPAW* 1934, XXVII, 872) who received such revelations communicated them to their disciples, who, in turn, handed them down to posterity. The importance which is thus attached to the mediation of the disciples is confirmed in *Keph.* 6,16ff and 8,28ff. (W. B. Henning's rather negative conclusions regarding the value of the Manichaean "Tradition," in *Asia Major* 3 [1953] 211, will have to be revised.) Here again, the parallelism between Mani and St. Paul is noteworthy (below, nn. 36–37): Paul's visions were derided by his Jewish-Christian detractors (below, nn. 105 and 109; cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Jüdenchristentum, Gnosis* [Tübingen 1956]

accounts, esoteric and profane, the request for two Manis was indeed a touchy subject, because it struck at the very roots of Mani's existence, either as the Apostle of God who had a unique mission that was not transferable, or as a figure with a definite, historical background. To duplicate the one or the other would have meant to do away with him.⁹

For all its simple-mindedness, the question hit home with Mani, though not quite in the manner in which the disciple might have expected. Mani realized the implications and immediately shook his head in dissent, a rare reaction and indicative of his concern. "Lo," he said, "I am the only Mani and came into the world in order to preach the word of God and to carry out his good will that was entrusted to me."¹⁰ The remainder of Mani's reply consists of a long and impassioned enumeration of the tribulations and hardships of his missionary life, much in the spirit of St. Paul in II Corinthians, but less stylized and with less regard for circumstantial detail.¹¹ Mani emphasizes the large geographical area which he covered during his journeys; he mentions India, Persia, and Mesene, the land of Babylon and the country of the Medes and Parthians — a catalogue which is familiar to us from his other writings.¹² He also relates the opposition and the hostility he encountered from the mighty of this world, from the many dynasts and the many religious leaders who were unable to tolerate him, the only Mani. Both Mani's singularity and his aloneness as opposed to the plurality of the world are stressed repeatedly in the Coptic text by the emphatic use of the phrase **ΑΝΑΚ ΟΥΜΑΝΝΙΧΑΙΟC ΝΟΥΩΤ** "I am the *only* Mani."¹³ The world loves the Darkness and hates the Light, Mani asserts, because its deeds are evil. This is the reason why there was much confusion and turmoil over the one Mani. "What then," Mani concludes, "if two Manis had

^{14ff} on *Hom. Clem.* 17.14–19), but were extolled by his Gnostic admirers (Marcion ap. Iren. *Haer.* 3.13.1 *solum Paulum veritatem cognovisse, cui per revelationem manifestatum est mysterium*; cf. H.-Fr. Weiss, "Paulus und die Häretiker," in W. Eltester (ed.), *Christentum und Gnosis*. Beiheft z. *ZNW* 37 [Berlin 1969] 116–128).

⁹ According to an Arabic source, Mani had claimed in his *Gospel* to be "the seal of the prophets" ("Mani-Codex" 109 n. 25). Hence in Mani's own conception his uniqueness was that he had put the final stamp on all previous revelation. The cyclic incarnations of god-sent messengers (below, nn. 29 and 118) had come to a definite end in Mani.

¹⁰ *Keph.* 184,2–5.

¹¹ 2 Cor. 11.16–33.

¹² *Keph.* 185,4–187,25; cf. *ibid.* 15,29–16,2; *Hom.* 44,10ff and 76,27ff.

¹³ *Keph.* 184,3, 6, 17; 187,27; 188,2, 6, 13; cf. *ibid.* 255,22–257,7 (see A. Böhlig [above, n. 2] 262).

come into this world? Which place could bear them and which country would admit them?"¹⁴

Mani's answer is more sympathetic than doctrinal. Theology is touched upon only at the very beginning, where he defines and justifies his existence on earth in terms of his apostleship. Apparently, he did not want to encumber the simple mind of the disciple with the weighty metaphysics of his vocation. As elsewhere in the *Kephalaia*, Mani's deep knowledge of the human soul enabled him to adapt himself to the psychic pattern and the intellectual level of his interlocutor.¹⁵ We can assume, therefore, that Mani purposefully designed his answer to be as plain and unpretentious as his disciple's request. Its simplicity is transparent and can best be described as combining Johannine symbolism with the Gnostic and Neoplatonic concept of the One versus the Many. This contrast between the single Mani and the plurality of the world must have been more to Mani than merely numerical and quantitative. Otherwise, his answer to the disciple would have been something like this: "Yes, my son, you are perfectly right: Two Manis would be much more able to cope with the boundless unbelief of the world and of its numerous dynasts." Mani, however, did not say that the world was too much for him to cope with, but that he was too much for the world to bear, a world not prepared to listen to his gospel. The antithesis is one of quality, therefore, reducing the world and everything in it to the basic dualistic structure which underlies all Gnostic systems: The One versus the Many, Light versus Darkness, Gnosis versus Ignorance.¹⁶ This kind of language was easy to understand for any religious person in the third century A.D., even for the poor in spirit, because it was current coinage and almost self-explanatory. The Prologue of the Gospel of John provides early and significant illustration: "The Light shines in the Darkness and the Darkness comprehended it not," or: "He came into His own, and His own received Him not." It should here be recalled that Mani had identified himself with the Paraclete of the Fourth Gospel.¹⁷ For the antithesis of the One versus the Many, on the other hand, we may turn to the Gospel of Thomas, which refers in unambiguous terms to the primitive oneness of the noetic realm and to the subsequent separation which resulted in the multiplicity that characterizes the universe and this world: "On

¹⁴ *Keph.* 188,4–6; cf. *ibid.* 100,23–101,8.

¹⁵ Cf. *Keph.* ch. LVII (esp. 146,26f), LXXXIII, LXXXVIII, LXXXIX.

¹⁶ Cf. *CMC* 84,12ff ("Mani-Codex" 137 n. 103).

¹⁷ "Mani-Codex" 108 n. 22, 163 n. 165. For Mani's adaptation of John 1.11 at *Keph.* 259,13–15 see A. Böhlig (above, n. 2) 265. Cf. below, n. 57.

the day when you were one, you became two. But when you have become two, what will you do?"¹⁸

II

There remains the important question of authenticity. To what extent do the *Kephalaia* in general and the passage under discussion in particular reproduce the true doctrine and perhaps the *ipsissima verba* of Mani? Most of Mani's theological lectures collected in the *Kephalaia* are introduced by phrases such as: "Again Mani said to his disciples."¹⁹ No one would attach much credit to such a formula as being a mark of authenticity in the gospel tradition, especially in its Gnostic ramifications like the Gospel of Thomas, where this label, with minor variations, is used as a conventional incipit for the Sayings of Jesus.²⁰ It would be uncritical, however, to apply to the early Manichaean literature the same analytic criteria which are used when dealing with the scanty remains of the Christian pre-literature of the apostolic period to be traced in the Gospels.²¹ The two centuries that had intervened had brought about a tremendous change in historical perspective. True, Mani had a large Christian literature at his disposal, including Tatian's *Diatessaron*, St. Paul's Epistles, and some of the apocryphal Acts, and he and his followers availed themselves freely of these writings and of the literary forms which they represent.²² But Mani as a man of letters and a man of books had a keen sense of authenticity with regard to his own person and his own preaching. Thus, he found fault with Jesus and with earlier religious teachers of mankind, who in his eyes had failed to commit their message to writing and had left it to their disciples to be transmitted to posterity, thus exposing it to

¹⁸ *The Gospel According to Thomas*, ed. A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, *et alii* (Leiden and New York 1959) Logion 11 (II, 34,22–25). Cf. H. Jonas (above, n. 5) 59ff.

¹⁹ Cf. the list of introductory formulae in A. Böhlig (above, n. 2) 234.

²⁰ Cf. H.-Ch. Puech in *Annuaire du Collège de France* 57 (1957) 233–237, *ibid.* 58 (1958) 235; J. M. Robinson, "Logoi Sophon," in J. M. Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia 1971) 71–113, esp. 91.

²¹ Cf. H. Koester, "One Jesus and four primitive gospels," *HThR* 61 (1968) 203–247 (= Robinson–Koester [preceding note] 158–204).

²² P. Alfaric, *Les Écritures manichéennes* II (Paris 1919) 169ff; F. W. K. Müller, "Eine Hermas-Stelle in manichäischer Version," *SPAW* 1905, LI, 1077–1083 (cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Rel. Man.* [below, n. 33] 96); A. Böhlig (above, n. 2) 202ff, esp. 212ff; H.-Ch. Puech in E. Hennecke und W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (3rd ed., Tübingen 1959) 261–265; F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine* (Paris 1970) 151–182. See below, nn. 29, 37, 102.

the hazards of an indirect tradition that lacked the control provided by authentic texts.²³ Mani was not willing to allow himself or his disciples to make the same mistake. Instead, he created his own canon of sacred books, all of which were written during his lifetime and, what is more, by himself. In addition, he encouraged his disciples to write down and collect his speeches and sermons and his occasional words of wisdom. This was not extraordinary in a time when shorthand was easily available and when Manichaean scribes were the constant companions of the Manichaean missionaries.²⁴ The tradition that resulted from the literary activity of Mani's most intimate disciples is neither oral nor apocryphal, but essentially authentic, and it forms the nucleus of later works on Mani's life and the early history of the Manichaean church.

The Cologne Mani-Codex, a new and precious Greek biographical source, consists of I-narratives of Mani, prefaced by formulae like "Furthermore he said" (*πάλιν ἔλεγεν*) or "My Lord said" (*ἔφη ὁ κύριός μου*), which are more or less identical with the introductory phrases used in the Coptic *Kephalaia*.²⁵ But — and this is the extraordinary feature — the name of a Manichaean authority is attached to each of the groups of quotations to indicate the high degree of authenticity in the reports that follow. These names are by no means mere shadows; with one exception, all of the authorities that are named were already known to us either from other Manichaean sources or from later Christian abjurations, where they are mentioned as close associates of Mani and as leading figures in the Manichaean church of the generation after Mani's death.²⁶ Therefore, the new material of the Cologne codex

²³ *Keph.* 7,6ff (see above, n. 8); cf. M 5794 I RV in Andreas-Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica II," *SPAW* 1933, VII, 295f (repr. in A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus. Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen u. Übungen*, 175 [2nd ed., Berlin 1969] 6f).

²⁴ On the general availability of *Greek* shorthand in Egypt, Bostra, and Syrian Antioch during the 3rd century A.D. and its use in the recording of theological disputations, see C. Andresen, *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit. Die Religionen der Menschheit*, 29 (Stuttgart 1971) 177f. (Later practice is vividly illustrated in Marc. Diac. *V. Porph.* 88.) Nothing seems to be known about *Syriac* shorthand in the same century. But the theological and literary activities in Syriac-speaking centers of learning during this period can hardly be accounted for without the existence and extensive use of shorthand systems. On the Manichaean scribes see M 2 and M 216 in Andreas-Henning (preceding note) 301ff.

²⁵ *CMC* 69,9 (*πάλιν ἔλεγεν*), 79,14 (*ἔφη ὁ κύριός μου*), 74,9 (*ἔφη ὁ κύριος*), 14,4 (*ἔλεγεν ὁ κύριός μου*), 19,7f (καὶ *πάλιν εἶπεν οὕτως*), 68,5f (*ἔφη δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν*); see above, n. 19.

²⁶ Cf. "Mani-Codex" 110ff.

is not derived from anonymous oral tradition but from memoir-like literary sources.²⁷ These sources were written by the authorities whose names appear as titles in the codex. They consist of Mani's own words, either as recorded by these authorities or as excerpted by them from Mani's canonical works — for instance, from his Gospel and his Letter to Edessa.²⁸ In one case, quotations from St. Paul and from Gnostic revelations were added for the apologetic purpose of providing parallels for the similar visions experienced and recorded by Mani.²⁹

²⁷ A detailed study of the formal structure of the Cologne Codex, which provides additional evidence for the authenticity of the new material, will be published elsewhere by L. Koenen.

²⁸ CMC 64,3–7 *καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ π(ατ)ὴρ ἡμῶν* (i.e. Mani) *φησιν ἐν τοῖς συγχράμμασιν οἷς ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἔδεα<σ>αν* (quotations from the letter follow). Ibid. 65,23–66,3 *ἔγραψεν [δὲ πάλιν καὶ] εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς ἀγωτάτης αὐτοῦ ἐλπίδος* (cf. *Evangelium Veritatis* 17,2f: “This name of the Gospel is the revelation of Hope,” on which see H. Jonas, *Gnomon* 32 [1960] 328f). Quotations follow, in which Mani refers to his Gospel as *τόδε τὸ ἀθάνατον εὐαγγέλιον* (CMC 67,13f), thus confirming the traditional title “Living Gospel” (cf. “Mani-Codex” 108f and 190ff). It should be noted that in the various titles which refer to Mani's Gospel, the term *εὐαγγέλιον* must be taken in the literal sense of *Frohbotschaft* (as in the Gnostic tradition) and not form-critically as denoting an established literary genre (cf. J. M. Robinson in Robinson–Koester [above, n. 20] 74ff; A. Böhlig in *Christentum u. Gnosis* [above, n. 8] 5f; E. Haenchen, “Neutestamentliche und gnostische Evangelien,” *ibid.* 19–45). In terms of form, however, Mani's Gospel begins with the Pauline formula used elsewhere by Mani to introduce his letters. (In his Gospel, this formula probably serves as a mark of authenticity.) The Gospel continues first with a doxology (CMC 66,7–23) immediately followed by a protreptic summary of Mani's spiritual *res gestae* (*ibid.* 66,23–68,5), and later with a homily (*ibid.* 68,6–69,8). The new fragments from Mani's Gospel confirm Puech's tentative conclusion that we are dealing with “einem Werk lehrhaften und dogmatischen Charakters” (in Hennecke–Schneemelcher I [above, n. 22] 267).

²⁹ CMC 48,16–60,12 quotes extensively from five Revelations (*ἀποκαλύψεις*, a term apparently used as a book-title, cf. A. D. Nock, *HThR* 57 [1964] 260 n. 11; H.-Ch. Puech in *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* 5 [1957, publ. 1960] 161–190), no doubt borrowed or adapted from semi-gnostic Judaism, which are ascribed to Adam (cf. K. Rudolph, “Gnosis und Manichäismus nach d. koptischen Quellen,” *Koptologische Studien in der DDR*. Wissenschaftliche Zeitschr. d. Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Sonderheft 1965, 169f), Sethel (e.g. *Keph.* 12,10, 42,26, 145,27; M 22 R in W. B. Henning, “Henochbuch” [above, n. 6] 28; cf. G. Flügel, *Mani. Seine Lehre u. seine Schriften* [Leipzig 1862] 269, K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* I [Göttingen 1960] 184), Enos, Shem, and Enoch respectively and which are not identical with extant apocalyptic literature (“Mani-Codex” 107). Similar series of names occur elsewhere in Manichaean literature in enumerations of Mani's predecessors (above, n. 6; for the doctrine of the cyclic incarnation of the True Prophet see below, nn. 118–120). The new material in the Cologne Codex provides a fresh

Justin's definition, perhaps influenced by Papias, of the synoptic tradition as "apostolic memoirs" (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*),³⁰ though hardly adequate to the Gospels, would well describe the character of part of the material on which the biographic coverage of Mani's life is based. Certain Greek-speaking Manichees must have felt the same way; for a Manichaean work with the title *Ἀπομνημονεύμάτων βίβλος* is attested. This is obviously an unofficial name given to a Life of Mani similar to that of the Cologne Codex, i.e., based on autobiographical data in Mani's own writings and on recollections of his disciples.³¹ This new insight into the Manichaean practice of authentication gives us more confidence than we used to have in the literary form and the content of the *Kephalaia*.

III

There are, of course, other and more direct ways of vindicating the general truth of the traditions about Mani that are collected in the *Kephalaia*. Attention has been drawn to the peculiar setting of several chapters, which sketch situations and locations far too unusual to be mere inventions.³² In our case, for example, the triple sequence of audiences with Shapur I is more than plausible, for there is convincing evidence of a casual contact between Mani and the monarch, although the Cologne Codex has discredited as a late fabrication the story which synchronized Mani's first public appearance, Shapur's coronation and Mani's first meeting with the king.³³

The authenticity of the *Kephalaia* is particularly in evidence when the doctrinal substance of individual chapters and the religious terminol-

basis for the study of the interrelation of apocalyptic and Gnostic revelation; cf. H. Koester in Robinson-Koester (above, n. 20) 193ff. For the references to Paul in *CMC* see "Mani-Codex" 114f, and below, n. 36.

³⁰ Papias ap. Eus. *H.E.* 3.39.15; Just. *I. Apol.* 66.3 (cf. 33.5), *Dial.* 103ff. *passim*. Cf. R. M. Grant, *The Earliest Lives of Jesus* (New York 1961) 15–20, 119–121; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (English trans., London 1966) 32, 341.

³¹ *PG* I, 1468 A. Cf. "Mani-Codex" 113 n. 36; H.-Ch. Puech, *Le Manichéisme. Son fondateur, sa doctrine* (Paris 1949) 112f n. 97.

³² A. Böhlig (above, n. 2) 234f.

³³ Much has been made of this synchronism in modern scholarship. The supposed event was ceremoniously labeled "Pentecost of the Manichaean Religion" (F. C. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees* [Cambridge 1925] 3). Cf. "Mani-Codex" 126ff, and, for a timely word of caution, P. Brown, "The diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire," *JRS* 59 (1969) 92ff (reprinted, with expanded footnotes, in *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustin* [London 1972] 94ff).

ogy in which it is phrased can be paralleled from other early Manichaean sources. Such parallels are frequent, because Mani's theology and Mani's language follow a consistent pattern in all the extant documents. According to Mani's own statement, his theological system in all its essential parts took shape, with divine inspiration constantly at work, during the twelve years that preceded his first public appearance as preacher of the new gospel of hope in 240 A.D.³⁴ Mani was twenty-four years old at that time, and it was at the age of twelve that he claims to have experienced his first major revelation in which the Twin of Light was instrumental.³⁵ Although the example of the twelve-year-old Jesus displaying his prodigious wisdom in the Temple may have influenced Mani's choice of that particular age, it would be unreasonable to doubt such an early development. Whatever we think of divine revelations and the part they play in the shaping of a new religion, we have to admit that prophetic gifts and religious genius usually show themselves at an early age, and that this visionary experience must have been as real and overwhelming for the young Mani as it had been for St. Paul, whom Tertullian called "Apostle of the heretics."³⁶ Mani's admiration for, and imitation of, St. Paul as the Christian prototype of the itinerant missionary is well documented.³⁷ But to account for the development of as powerful a personality as that of Mani in terms of a

³⁴ The capital texts for Mani's two major revelations (see following note) are for the first revelation, *Keph.* 14,31–15,24 and *CMC* 19,8–24,16 (cf. "Mani-Codex" nn. 171, 176, 207), for the second revelation *CMC* 104,12–105,8 (ibid. n. 175), and for both revelations *Fihrist* I p. 328 ed. Flügel (cf. K. Kessler, *Mani. Forschungen über die manich. Religion* [Berlin 1889] 384f; A. Adam [above, n. 23] 25 and 118). According to Mani's own testimony in both *Keph.* and *CMC* the content of his first revelation was theological in that it provided Mani with the basis for his doctrine; his second revelation was ecclesiastical in that Mani was directed to begin his missionary work. Mani's extant accounts of his two major revelations, though divergent in detail, are identical in substance. The reference in the *Fihrist* to Mani's *first* revelation, which has no parallel in either *CMC* or *Keph.*, seems to be a paraphrase by an-Nadim rather than a verbatim quotation from Mani's own works.

³⁵ "Mani-Codex" 119ff (to be modified in the light of R. Köbert, "Orientalistische Bemerkungen zum Kölner Mani-Codex," *ZPE* 8 [1971] 243–247, and L. Koenen, "Das Datum der Offenbarung und Geburt Manis," *ibid.* 247ff).

³⁶ *Adv. Marc.* 3,5 (CSEL 47 p. 382,26f). The Manichees were well aware of the affinity between Mani's revelations (above, nn. 34–35) and those of Paul; see *CMC* 60,13–62,9 (above, n. 29) and *Keph.* 19,11.

³⁷ H.-Ch. Puech, "Saint Paul chez les manichéens d'Asie Centrale," *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions* (Tokyo 1960) 176–187; P. Brown, "The diffusion of Manichaeism" (above, n. 33) 94 (= *Religion and Society* [ibid.] 98f). Cf. "Mani-Codex" 114f, 138f, 198f.

deliberately cultivated *imitatio Pauli* would be to see in Mani nothing but an impostor and to misunderstand the very nature of religious prophecy as practiced in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic circles, which regarded the experience of revelation as a discipline that could be handed down from teacher to disciple through the grace of God. It was in this spirit that Mani was brought up.³⁸ We may conclude, then, that Mani's theology, once conceived, admitted of little, if any, substantial change, and that the several books he produced are a monument of systematization rather than landmarks of a continuous intellectual evolution. Mani's theological vocabulary, originally Syriac, was equally uniform and survived translation into several languages. It is this consistency in diction and subject matter that makes source analysis on a comparative basis such a useful tool in Manichaean studies.

With this in mind, let us return for a moment to the chapter of the *Kephalaia* in which Mani points out the impossibility of having two Manis. It is hardly surprising to find in the Cologne Codex several passages in which similar emphasis is placed on the confrontation between the single Mani and the many powers of this world. These parallels will add a new dimension to our previous interpretation. In a sudden fit of despair and discouragement, apparently not long after his first revelation, Mani seeks comfort in a soliloquy in which he pictures his hopeless position in the hostile environment of the baptist sect from which he had alienated himself: "They are many," he complains, "but I am alone; they are rich, but I am poor. How shall I be able, therefore, the one against all of them, to reveal this mystery amidst the crowd that is entangled in error?"³⁹ Immediately, the celestial Twin appeared and dispelled Mani's doubts. At a later instance, Mani compares himself to a stranger and a solitary (*δθνεῖος καὶ μονῆρης*) in the midst of these baptists.⁴⁰ In both cases the clash was not yet between the world of the Sassanian Empire on the one side and the fervent warrior for a new creed on the other, who would fight his way from the Persian Gulf in the south to the Caspian Sea in the north

³⁸ The baptist community, in which Mani spent twenty years early in his life, believed in divine revelation and inspiration as proofs of prophetic vocation; see "Mani-Codex" 139, and below, n. 119.

³⁹ CMC 31,1-9 ("Mani-Codex" 178 n. 202).

⁴⁰ CMC 44,2-12 τότε παραχρῆμα διεῖλον ἐμαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν τάξεων ἐκείνου τοῦ δόγματος (the more common term in CMC is *νόμος*, see below, n. 89) καθ' ὁ ἀνετράφην· καὶ γέγονα παραπλήσιος δύνειαι καὶ μονῆρης ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν μέχρι φθάσαι τὸν και[ρὸν τοῦ ἀπό]βην με ἀ[π'] ἐκείνους τοῦ δόγμα[τος καθ' ὁ ἀνετρ]άφην. Cf. CMC 102,9-11 ("Mani-Codex" 177 n. 201). On the spiritual and monastic connotations of the Syriac term *nūkrāyē* (*δθνεῖοι*) see A. Adam, *Sprache u. Dogma* (below, n. 49) 87.

and the Indus valley in the east. Mani's dimensions were still provincial, and his activities confined to some scattered villages in the swampy marshes of the Sassanid province of Mesene. His spirit was not yet one of defiance and superiority, but of anguish and depression. After all, he was a youth in his teens, already aware of his estrangement and his singularity, but still lacking the kind of self-assurance that was the hallmark of his future success. Some twelve years later, at the age of twenty-four, after the final and painful confrontation with, and separation from, the baptists with whom he had lived for twenty years, he was even more depressed than before. He turned to God in prayer, and encouragement came in the form of the second major revelation, transmitted by the Twin of Light, whom Mani addressed as follows:

“I was reared and brought up in this sect of the baptists, and to its leaders and presbyters I was related through the upbringing of my body. If they, then, did not give me room for the acceptance of the truth, how will the world or its mighty or its doctrines accept me, in order to listen to these secrets and to accept these commandments which are heavy? How shall I perform in front of the kings and dynasts of the world and the founders of the sects? For behold, they are mighty and powerful in their wealth and their licence and their riches, whereas I am alone [μονογενῆς] and poor in these things?”⁴¹

Mani's language indicates a growing horizon and foreshadows his advancement from local heretic, of whom the world would have taken little notice, to a religious leader who left his mark upon history. We are thus prepared for the reply of the Twin of Light in which he commissions Mani to go out into the world.⁴²

There is no way of deciding whether the notion of human frailty and divine succor that pervades Mani's early self-analysis and that is so reminiscent of St. Paul's self-denial in submission to God's grace was a genuine attribute of the young Mani, or whether it is merely a

⁴¹ CMC 103,1-104,10 (cf. “Mani-Codex” 177 n. 201). There can be little doubt that Mani's ἐγώ δὲ μονογενῆς τε καὶ πένης τούτων (CMC 104,8-10) is derived from Ps. 24.16 (trans. LXX) ὅτι μονογενῆς καὶ πτωχός (cf. Ps. 34.10 πτωχὸν καὶ πένητα) εἰμι ἐγώ (trans. Aquila: μοναχὸς [see below, n. 52] καὶ πτωχός); on the Manichees' indebtedness to the Old Testament Psalter see A. Böhlig (above, n. 2) 215 (pace F. Decret [above, n. 22] 145 n. 1). Cf. the allegorical interpretation of Ps. 24.16 by Didymus of Alexandria, CPss. 87,7f ed. M. Gronewald (*Didymus der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar (Tura-Papyrus)*, Teil II. Papyrologische Texte u. Abhandlungen 4 [Bonn 1968]): “μονογενῆς” οὖν “εἰμι καὶ πτωχός,” καίτοι δοῦτω μονογενῆς (πτωχὸς *coniec.* Gronewald) πλούσιός ἐστιν “πλούσει” γὰρ “παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει” (cf. 1 Cor. 1.5).

⁴² CMC 104,12-105,8 (cf. “Mani-Codex” 167 n. 175).

façon de parler of the mature man who in retrospect envisaged his early life in seclusion and inactivity as a period of pusillanimity and weakness. Be that as it may, Mani's self-confidence was fully developed by the time he wrote his Gospel, which is most probably his first book and may well antedate his first missionary journey.⁴³ Among the several quotations from Mani's Gospel which are preserved in the Cologne Codex is the following passage: "The gift that was given to me by my [heavenly] father is very great and very rich. If the world and all of mankind were to listen to me, I would be able to make them rich by virtue of this very possession and gain which my father has given me, and to let wisdom suffice for all the world."⁴⁴ Within a very short period of time, the previous confession of poverty had turned into a promise of wealth to the whole world, an unmistakable allusion to the parable of the imperishable and spiritual treasures on which Mani elaborates elsewhere.⁴⁵

IV

It might seem that the downward road which leads from the theological and psychological aspects of Mani's self-conception to their philological root is neither short nor worth pursuing. And yet in this case it is both. We have seen how Mani emphasizes that he is "the only Mani," an expression which is capable of conveying the notions of aloneness and uniqueness. This ambiguity was meaningful to Mani, because it reflects the essential polarity which characterizes the Gnostic's existence in the world of matter: Mani is forlorn and menaced in that he dwells temporarily in the midst of a multitude given to ignorance; he is delivered and superior in that he, the elect, transcends the world. The invariable Coptic term to denote this "oneness" is ογωτ, whereas the three Greek synonyms that are interchangeably used are μόνος, μονήρης, and μονογενής. The Cologne Codex was translated from a Syriac original. This is an inference which rests on several linguistic observations. One of them, for instance, is the use of *αἱ πόλεις*,

⁴³ The only attempt to establish a relative chronology of Mani's writings was made by W. B. Henning in *Asia Minor* 3 (1953) 208f.

⁴⁴ CMC 68,17-69,8 (cf. "Mani-Codex" 98 n. 2); see above, n. 28.

⁴⁵ CMC 74,21-76,9 ("Mani-Codex" 155 n. 147). For the notion that the possession of Gnosis is spiritual wealth and that its absence is poverty, see *Gospel according to Thomas* (above, n. 18) Logion 3 (II, 33,2-5); cf. H.-Ch. Puech in *Annuaire du Collège de France* 59 (1959) 258f, 62 (1962) 201, 64 (1964/65) 214ff, 65 (1965/66) 250.

“the Cities,” for the twin cities of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, which is a literal rendering of the corresponding Syriac *m^{ed}inātā*.⁴⁶ Another is the misleading phrase *ἡμέρα τῆς σελήνης*, literally “the day of the moon,” in the only exact date which the Cologne Codex provides; this, in turn, is an awkward translation of a stereotyped Syriac formula, *bad^esahrā*, which specifies a date based on the Babylonian lunar calendar.⁴⁷ The Coptic Manichaica, on the other hand, are separated from the lost Syriac originals by the interposition of Greek translations from the Syriac, equally lost, with the exception of the Cologne Codex, which is the first witness for the existence of this intermediate Greek stage of Manichaean literature in Egypt. What used to be a scholarly theory has thus become an established fact. Since we are working with translation literature, any interpretation of Manichaean terminology that starts from Greek or Coptic translations of the underlying Syriac terms runs a certain risk. This risk, however, is reduced by the fact that the Manichaean translators were not only imbued with the modes of expression peculiar to their own religion, but must also have been familiar with Christian and, as we shall see, Neoplatonic language and literature.⁴⁸ Consequently, the translators had a large technical vocabulary at their command, and although they may occasionally struggle with the syntax of the language into which they translate, especially if it is from Syriac into Greek, their translations usually do full justice to the various syncretistic elements in Mani’s language.

Even so, it is imperative to ask ourselves whether the essential ambiguity which is inherent in the Greek terms *μόνος*, *μονήρης*, and *μονογενής*, applies equally to the underlying Syriac word or words, provided the latter can be ascertained. If not, Mani could hardly have

⁴⁶ “Mani-Codex” 105; cf. A. Christensen, *L’Iran sous les Sassanides* (2nd ed., Copenhagen 1944) 383f.

⁴⁷ R. Köbert (above, n. 35) 244ff.

⁴⁸ Below, n. 134. An interesting example of a common Greek word being given a new Manichaean connotation is the use of *εὐσέβεια(ι)* “alms” as a translation of the Syriac *zedqātā* (*ṣe*ḍāqā in Mishnaic and Talmudic Hebrew, *zidqā* in Mandaic; see K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* I 85, unduly criticized by E. M. Yamauchi [below, n. 80] 56, who did not take into account the decisive philological evidence), which is attested in Hegemon. *Arch.* 10 (p. 16, 11f ed. Beeson) and in *CMC* 9,8f, 9,12 and 35,8 (“Mani-Codex” nn. 129, 140, 144. The Manichaean translators into Coptic, however, in default of a literary equivalent, had to use **MNTNÆ** which corresponds to the standard Greek term *δελημοσίνη*; cf. A. Böhlig [above, n. 2] 258). The phrase *καὶ εὐσέβειας παρέχων τοῖς πέντε* in *Acta Thomae* 19 p. 128,6 (cf. 128,14f) ed. Bonnet could well go back to a *Manichaean* translator.

been aware of this ambiguity, and we would then be forced to give up an interpretation which is otherwise in perfect keeping with Mani's thinking. How, then, did Mani, in his native Syriac tongue, express the two aspects of his *μονότης*? The Greek *μονογενῆς*, a term of great significance in Christian literature, and a passage in the Syriac text of the Hymn of the Pearl provide the clues to the answer.

The Johannine *μονογενῆς* in the sense of "only-begotten" is consistently rendered into Syriac as *iħidāyā* or *iħidā*,⁴⁹ both formations are ultimately derived from *had* "one." Outside a specifically Johannine or christological context, however, *iħidāyā* was as ambiguous as the Greek *μόνος* and *μονήρης*. In addition, it was used as a key-word in its own right in the terminology of Syrian asceticism to denote the encratitic "solitaries," originally not in the sense of hermits but of celibates who led a single life by renouncing marriage and by severing all ties that connected them with the world.⁵⁰ This conception of *iħidāyē* was free of any Johannine connotations at the time it originated in the encratitic movements of eastern Syria, which — under the influence of Palestinian asceticism, Marcionism, and, later, Manichaeism — determined the course of Syrian Christianity in the late second and third centuries and left a lasting impress on the Syrian Church. The following passage from a Syriac baptismal liturgy which was quoted by Aphrahaṭ in 337, but has been shown to reflect the spirit of the previous century is vivid proof of how the concept of renunciation of the world and of selection influenced even the dispensation of the Christian sacraments, much as in Manichaeism: "The struggle is suitable for solitaries (*iħidāyē*), because their faces are set for that which is before them, and they do not remember something that lies behind them, for their treasures are before them."⁵¹ The allusions to Gnostic imagery need no comment. Stripped of most of its Christian disguise, the same Gnostic concept of the elect, who is a stranger in this world, was given a purer expression in the Gospel of Thomas: "Jesus said: Blessed are the solitary (*μοναχός*) and elect, for you shall find the Kingdom; because you come from it, you shall go there

⁴⁹ A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: I, The Origin of Asceticism; Early Monasticism in Persia*. CSCO, vol. 184, Subsidia 14 (Louvain 1958) 106ff; A. Adam, "Grundbegriffe des Mönchtums in sprachlicher Sicht," *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* 65 (1953/54) 209ff = *Sprache und Dogma* (Gütersloh 1969) 71ff, esp. 79ff.

⁵⁰ A. Vööbus (preceding note) 108.

⁵¹ Trans. Vööbus (above, n. 49) 93f. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity* (London 1904) 126ff; A. Guillaumont, "Monachisme et éthique judéo-chrétienne," *RechScRel* 60 (1972) 199–218, esp. 204.

again.”⁵² Mani could well have used both these texts for his purposes without changing a word. But it would be rash to assume that the Gospel of Thomas was known to Mani, let alone the baptismal liturgy, or to agree with those scholars who believe in an Aramaic or, more specifically, a Syriac original of the Gospel of Thomas.⁵³ Both assumptions, though attractive, take too much for granted.

There is a shortcut, however, which leads from the Hymn of the Pearl directly to Mani. It is generally agreed that Mani was acquainted with the original Syriac version of the Hymn of the Pearl, and a hymnic passage in the Cologne Codex which is full of reminiscences of this composition corroborates such a conclusion.⁵⁴ The Hymn of the Pearl centers around the Prince who, in the Manichaean interpretation, was the counterpart of Mani, and, like Mani, is described as a solitary and stranger in a couplet which reads: “Since I was one and all alone, I was a stranger to my fellow-dwellers in the inn.”⁵⁵ This is as close to Mani’s *δθνεῖος καὶ μονήρης* as it can be, and even the image of the world as a travelers’ inn recalls the following passage from Mani’s Gospel: “The truth I have shown to my fellow-travelers (*τοῖς ἐμοῖς ξυνεμπόροις*).”⁵⁶ The remaining linguistic data are equally conclusive. The two Syriac words which are used in the Hymn of the Pearl to

⁵² *Gospel according to Thomas* (above, n. 18) Logion 49 (II, 41,27–30); cf. Logion 75 (II, 46,11–13). On the Gnostic use of *μονάχος* see M. Harl, *Rev. Et. Gr.* 73 (1960) 464–474; H.-Ch. Puech in *Annuaire du Collège de France* 61 (1961/62) 179f, 62 (1962) 202; A. F. J. Klijn, *JBL* 81 (1962) 271–278; G. Quispel, *Vigiliae Christianae* 18 (1964) 233 and 235.

⁵³ On the controversy surrounding the *Gospel of Thomas* see H. Koester in Robinson-Koester (above, n. 20) 128ff; B. Ehlers, “Kann das Thomasevangelium aus Edessa stammen?”, *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970) 284–317. H.-Ch. Puech has shown that four of the Logia in the *Gospel of Thomas* (to which should be added August. *C. ep. fund.* 11 [CSEL 25 p. 206,18–24] = *C. Fel.* 1 [ibid. p. 801,17–24]) are also quoted in the Manichaean tradition (in Hennecke-Schneemelcher I [above, n. 22] 216f and 263; *Annuaire du Collège de France* 58 [1958] 234f, 59 [1959] 263). It is obvious that there is more than one possible explanation for this coincidence.

⁵⁴ Cf. *Hymn of the Pearl* 76–78 in *Acta Thomae* 112 p. 223,9–13 ed. Bonnet (for a recent translation of the Syriac version, see R. Köbert, *Orientalia* 38 [1969] 447–456, esp. 454); *CMC* 17,11–15 and 24,4–15 (“Mani-Codex” 168ff and 174f).

⁵⁵ *Hymn of the Pearl* 23 in *Acta Thomae* 109 p. 220,19f ed. Bonnet. The above translation, however, is based on the Syriac text (P. Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum Syriace* 3 [Paris-Leipzig 1892] p. 111; cf. R. Köbert [preceding note] 450).

⁵⁶ *CMC* 66,23–67,2 (“Mani-Codex” 200); for *δθνεῖος καὶ μονήρης* see above, n. 40.

express the idea of the Prince's oneness and aloneness are the adjective *had* and, from the same root, the participle *m^ešāw^had*, both of which are closely related to *iħidāyā* which we have recognized as the Syriac equivalent underlying the Greek *μονογενής*. Let us summarize: the triple series *μόνος*, *μονίρης*, and *μονογενής* quite possibly corresponds to the similar Syriac formations *had*, *m^ešāw^had*, and *iħidāyā*, and both sets of terms could be used to emphasize the singularity of the one Mani in all its aspects.

It remains to ask whether Mani added another dimension to his singularity by claiming to be the "only-begotten" of the Father of Greatness, who occupies the very apex of the Manichaean hierarchy of emanations, or, in other words, whether Mani understood the term *iħidāyā*, in addition to its usual connotations, in the Johannine sense of *μονογενής*. I think a strong case can be made for such an interpretation. Mani's Gospel begins with a doxology which is extant in the Cologne Codex. It is sufficient to quote the first sentence, the substance of which is repeated later: "I Mani, the apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, the father of truth, from whom I originate (ἐξ οὐ καὶ γέγονα)."⁵⁷ Mani does not say expressly that he is the *only*-begotten but in stressing the notion of his divine sonship, he must mean precisely this, because in his own system he had no rival.

V

Mani's awareness of, and insistence on, his own singularity is the basis of his self-conception, and any attempt to penetrate into Mani's complex personality has to start from that point.⁵⁸ But, as we have seen, Mani's self-understanding has little to do with the awareness of one's own individuality or terrestrial historicity, notions which would have been much less meaningful and important to Mani than they are to

⁵⁷ CMC 66,7; cf. ibid. 66,15–18 ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τούτου πέφυκα, εἰμὶ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (Mani's language is inspired by John 1.13); see "Mani-Codex" 198ff. *Μονογενής* is applied to the Father of Greatness at *Keph.* 34,23, to Jesus throughout the *Psalm-Book* (59,2, 60,8, 91,24; cf. J. Ries, "Jésus-Christ dans la religion de Mani," *Augustiniana* 14 [1964] 437ff esp. 451f), and to Mani in a Middle-Persian invocation (M 83 V 6–8) which reads: "Amen, to thee, first-born (*nūhzād*) Apostle, Divine Lord, Mani, our Saviour" (F. W. K. Müller, *Abh. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1904 [Anhang] 70n.; trans. F. C. Burkitt [above, n. 33] 92). The Middle-Persian *nūhzād* corresponds to the Greek *πρωτότοκος*; on the juxtaposition of *μονογενής* and *πρωτότοκος* in *Acta Thomae* 48 and 60 see H.-Ch. Puech in *Annuaire du Collège de France* 71 (1971) 267f.

⁵⁸ Cf. L. J. R. Ort (above, n. 1) 127ff.

us. The fact that Mani possessed an alter-ego in the form of the Twin of Light makes him a split personality⁵⁹ in the literal sense of that term rather than an individual: his human existence was nothing but a briefly reflected image of its true and eternal counterpart.⁶⁰ In like manner, Mani's conception of history was as different from any other ancient theory of, or approach to, history as it is from modern concepts, because he envisaged the history of mankind neither as a succession of political powers nor as an interplay of human actors, but as the mingling and separation of two opposed principles in which man had an auxiliary function only.⁶¹ This is the reason why the autobiographical passages in Mani's own writings and the biography which Mani's disciples composed are not always what a historian of religion would probably like them to be, namely, an uninterrupted and systematic series of vital facts and dates concerning Mani's life. One has to realize that Mani's biography is a history of salvation (*Heilsgeschichte*). It was written *sub specie ecclesiae et aeternitatis*, in that it was the first chapter of a more comprehensive history of the Manichaean Church, which in turn was interpreted as the final act in the cosmic battle between Light and Darkness.⁶² Theological considerations like these determined the title of Mani's biography as it is attested in the Cologne Codex. The title is "On the genesis of his body," where "body" must be comprehended in the ecclesiological sense of St. Paul's *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, i.e., as Mani's Church.⁶³ One of several reasons against a literal interpretation of *Περὶ τῆς γέννησις τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ* is that Mani's attitude toward physical reproduction was totally negative and that his disciples

⁵⁹ G. Haloun and W. B. Henning, *Asia Major* 3 (1953) 208.

⁶⁰ CMC 17,11-15 ("Mani-Codex" 169); *Hymn of the Pearl* 76 ("Mani-Codex" 174f).

⁶¹ The dualistic doctrine of the Two Principles is closely associated with Mani's soteriological interpretation of Time as a sequence of Three Epochs. Cf. e.g. P. Alfaric, *Écrit. manich.* II (above, n. 22) 66f; H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* I (3rd ed., Göttingen 1964) 286 and 304; H.-Ch. Puech, "La Gnose et le temps," *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 20 (1951) 57-113, esp. 99ff and 106ff (repr. in J. Campbell [ed.], *Man and Time*. Bollingen Series, 30.3 [New York 1957] 38-84); L. J. R. Ort (above, n. 1) 133.

⁶² Cf. "Mani-Codex" 113f on the lost Coptic continuation of the Cologne Life of Mani. The aim of the redactor of Mani's biography is thus comparable to the intentions of the author of Luke-Acts.

⁶³ L. Koenen, *ZPE* 8 (1971) 250. See *Keph.* 14,24ff and 36,3-5 (cf. *ibid.* 10,8-11,16 and 156,11; for the Elect as Mani's "members" [μέλη]; cf. St. Paul's usage] see *ibid.* 34,6 and 41,26); C. Colpe, "Zur Leib-Christi-Vorstellung im Epheserbrief," *Festschrift J. Jeremias*. Beiheft z. *ZNW* 26 (Berlin 1960) 172-187; C. Andresen (above, n. 24) 31.

would hardly have dared to refer to it openly in the title of his biography.⁶⁴

It follows from Mani's metaphysical concept of history and from the soteriological interpretation he gave to his own life that the scope and content of Mani's biography are governed by selective principles which are neither genuinely biographical nor always historical, but theological and, more specifically, ecclesiastical. In order to qualify for inclusion in this biographical tradition, an event in Mani's life had to be essential for the origin or the expansion of the Manichaean Church. Consequently, instances of divine intervention such as visions, revelations, and miracles were regarded as essential and treated like historical facts, in some exceptional cases with good reason. Mani's two major revelations, for instance, whatever their factual background, are of prime importance historically, because they determined the future course of Mani's life. This explains why they are, apart from Mani's birth, the only events in his life which Mani thought it necessary to date accurately within the framework of contemporary Sassanian history.⁶⁵ The accounts of Mani's first missionary journeys as extant in the Cologne Codex, on the other hand, bear little resemblance to a travel journal.⁶⁶ In their

⁶⁴ The title *Περὶ τῆς γέννησις τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ* seems to be borrowed from CMC 46,8f (in a passage on Mani's visions which can be attributed to Baraies; see above, n. 8), where it occurs in a fragmentary context, but apparently without reference to Mani's physical birth. The metaphor of a mother rejoicing instantly after childbirth (*Keph.* 205,26ff) is a rare exception in Manichaean texts and should be contrasted with "the demon who delivers the stink of birth" in *Keph.* 108,6.

⁶⁵ "Mani-Codex" 119ff.

⁶⁶ CMC pp. 116–192. (The last extant quire [pp. 169–192] is too fragmentary to allow identification of its content.) Even if this part of the Cologne Codex were more complete, the epitome-like arrangement of the material and the resulting discontinuity would make it difficult to reconstruct an itinerary which is chronologically and topographically coherent. Some of the peoples, places, and provinces which Mani visited are mentioned by name. On p. 121 we find the Medes (*Μῆδοι*) and the city of Ganzak (spelled both *Τονναζακ* and *Γανναζακ*; contrast *Γάνζακα* in Procop. *Bell. Pers.* 2,24), i.e. Shiz in Media Athropatene [Azerbaijan] (cf. G. Hoffmann, "Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer," *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 7,3 [Leipzig 1880] 250–253); both references show that Mani's first missionary journey was not to India (W. Sundermann, "Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 24 [1971] 79–125, 371–379) but in a northeastern direction to one of the major Iranian sanctuaries which was the religious and ideological center of the Sassanian monarchy (A. Christensen [above, n. 46] 166f). Forat (*Βαστρα*) is mentioned next (CMC 140,3–6 *εἰς Φαρατ* τὴν [πόλιν] *πλησίον τῆς* [νήσου] *τῶν Μαιῶν* [νῶν]). Cf. Dio Cass. 68.28.4; PW 15,1 s.v.

neglect of geographical and chronological detail and their almost exclusive concentration on the miraculous element, they will prove to contain even less useful evidence for a complete reconstruction of Mani's actual routes than the Pauline Epistles and Acts provide for St. Paul's. But it would be pretentious to look at Mani's biography only as a historical source. To put it bluntly, which is to exaggerate: hagiography is not historiography. Judged by its own standard, however, the material contained in the new codex must be given a high rating. There are two or three stories of doubtful historicity, which are markedly different from all the rest and which must have been included for the sole purpose of pious edification and religious instruction.⁶⁷ But even they are so powerful in their imagery and so persuasive in their vivid illustration of Manichaean doctrine that one would not hesitate to credit Mani with them.

The extant accounts of the twenty years of Mani's life that were spent in the community of the baptists are characterized by a marked emphasis on divine revelation; likewise, in the accounts of his subsequent missionary activities the miraculous element prevails. Both sets of excerpts, therefore, suffer from a considerable amount of repetition, because each revelation and each miracle follows a common narrative pattern, although the content varies.⁶⁸ This repetition is particularly striking in the early sections of the Cologne Codex, where independent accounts of Mani's first revelation have been collected and purposefully conflated with different accounts referring to his second revelation.⁶⁹ In both cases, revelations and miracles, it is left to the modern critic to remove the areatalogical varnish from the underlying factual background.

Mesene 1082ff). Another mention of Forat follows on p. 144, in connection with merchants and ships which travel [? The verb is lost] to the Persians and Indians (*Ινδοι*). Finally, Armenia and Persia (*Περσίς*) occur on p. 146.

⁶⁷ CMC 10,4-15 ("Mani-Codex" 147 n. 130); CMC 74,21-76,9 (ibid. 155 n. 147); CMC 77,14-79,8 (cf. ibid. 156 n. 149).

⁶⁸ Part of this pattern consists of the stereotyped formulae which introduce Mani's accounts of his revelations in CMC 18,10ff ("Mani-Codex" 120 n. 52), 64,15ff (ibid. 113 n. 35), 69,9ff (ibid. 165 n. 169).

⁶⁹ CMC 18,1-19,7 ("Mani-Codex" 120 n. 52, 165 n. 170, 167 n. 177) introduces a revelation which is dated to Mani's *εἰκοστὸν καὶ πέμπτον ἔτος* (CMC 73,5-6) and which is therefore his *second* major revelation (above, nn. 34-35). The immediately following quotation (CMC 19,7-24,16; "Mani-Codex" 166 and 168) is so similar to Mani's account of his *first* revelation in *Keph.* 14,31ff (above, n. 34; "Mani-Codex" 163) that both passages must refer to the same event.

VI

But sandwiched between the stereotyped accounts of Mani's quiet life in the baptist sect and those of his first contact with the world is an intermediate group of continuous texts which cover more than twenty pages of the Cologne Codex and are derived from two Manichaean authorities, Baraies and Timotheos.⁷⁰ These two narratives provide us with detailed documentation on the period of transition, presumably of very short duration, in which the latent differences between Mani and the baptists erupted in a series of heated theological disputations. This confrontation signals the open breach between Mani and the religious environment in which he had been raised. The actual birth hour of Manichaeism arrived when, after the futile exchange of many arguments, Mani's physical existence was threatened by the hostility of the baptists, who launched an assault against him which turned out to be the very cutting of the umbilical cord. The Cologne Codex describes vividly Mani's violent expulsion from the baptist community, thus confirming a brief reference to the same effect in Theodore bar Kōnai.⁷¹ Mani survived this ordeal as an independent personality, ready to lead his own life; the baptists survived it too, but at the price of a schism that must have disrupted their ranks more seriously than the passing allusions in the Cologne Codex suggest.⁷² The defection of three baptists to Manichaeism, including Mani's father Pattikios, who was highly regarded in the baptist sect, was presumably the beginning of a continuing process.⁷³ Two passages in the *Kephalaia* suggest that the open conflict between the baptists and Mani continued to be an obstacle for both parties.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ CMC 79,13–99,9 (Baraies), 99,11–114,5 (Timotheos); cf. “Mani-Codex” 133–160.

⁷¹ Theodore bar Kōnai, *Liber Scholiorum* XI p. 311,16ff (CSCO 66; trans. A. Adam [above, n. 23] 75f): “Und weil ihn die Reinigungsanhänger nicht ertragen konnten, schlossen sie ihn aus ihrer Gemeinschaft aus” (italics mine). CMC 100,1–101,3 narrates how Mani's recalcitrant opposition infuriated the baptists so that they beat and maltreated him, seized him by his hair, shouted at him as if he were possessed by a demon, and would even have strangled him (CMC 100,17–20 καὶ βούλα[με]νοι διὰ τοῦ προσόν[τος α]ὐτοῖς φθόνον ἀπ[άγξαι] με), if Mani's father Pattikios had not intervened and saved his life.

⁷² CMC 87,6–12 (“Mani-Codex” 157 n. 152) ἀλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον· μὴ ἄρα Πλάνη (on the personification of Error, see A. D. Nock, *HThR* 57 [1964] 275) ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν αὐτῶν φθεγγομένη καὶ βούλεται τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν ἀποπλανῆσαι καὶ διχάσαι τὸ δόγμα (Matth. 10,35 ἥλθον γάρ διχάσαι ἀνθρώπους κτλ. Cf. J. Jeremias in Hennecke–Schneemelcher I [above, n. 22] 54; C. Andresen [above, n. 24] 255ff).

⁷³ CMC 106,5–22 (cf. “Mani-Codex” 130f).

⁷⁴ *Keph.* 33,29–32 and 44,24ff. In the former passage, the undefined adherents

The new and unparalleled information on the organization, the ritual practices, and, in a few instances, the theology of this baptist sect is perhaps the most substantial contribution to the history of religion in the new codex. It is here, and only here, that the inherent tension of the situation and the excitement of Mani's two speeches and of the connecting narrative are breathtaking even for the modern reader. It is here, more than in any other section of the codex, that one is convinced that he is witnessing the shaping of history. However, even here we have to be on our guard. Speeches are known to be an important instrument used by ancient writers of history, whether religious or secular, in presenting their own evaluations of historical figures or important events. This is why speeches are a notoriously unreliable source of information. In our case, the circumstances that led to the survival, or revival, of what was actually said in that particular situation are less complex than usual, because Mani is both the main actor and the final authority who must have remembered this confrontation throughout his life. It is understandable that Mani devotes more space to the exposition of his own arguments than to that of his opponents, who are allowed brief exclamations and interjections only and whose opinions are usually summarized in narrative passages.

For the modern critic, this technique has a negative implication in that it produces the tendency of seeing the institutions of the baptists through Manichaean spectacles instead of describing them for their own sake. It is especially the doctrines put into the mouth of Elchasai that are thoroughly Manichaean. Elchasai, who lived in the early second century A.D., presumably in northern Mesopotamia, was the founder of a baptist sect with predominantly Jewish-Christian, rather than Gnostic, basis.⁷⁵ A reliable Arabic source mentions him also as the founder of the Babylonian baptists, whom Mani's father had joined

of the "baptism by water" (**ΠΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΝΜΜΟΥΓΙΕΥΕ**) invite speculation (cf. A. Vööbus [above, n. 49] 122 n. 61). The phrase, which is reminiscent of *CMC* 82,23–83,3 *καὶ τοῦτο δέ ὁ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν βαπτίζεσθε ἐν ὕδασιν οὐδὲν τυγχάνει* ("Mani-Codex" 141 n. 116), is more likely to be aimed at the practices of the Babylonian baptists than at orthodox Christian baptism. The plural "sects of error" (**ΝΔΟΓΜΑ ΝΤΕ ΤΠΛΑΝΗ**, cf. above, n. 72), if to be taken literally, would indicate that Mani had several such groups in mind, and not only the baptist sect in which he was brought up. *Keph.* 44,24ff is a clear reference to the *δόγμα* (below, n. 89) *τῶν βαπτιστῶν*, who are distinguished from the so-called *Καθέριοι* (cf. K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* I, 43f).

⁷⁵ On Elchasai, see e.g. W. Brandt, *Elchasai. Ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk* (Leipzig 1912); G. Strecker, *RAC* 4 (1959) 1171ff; D. Flusser, *Numen* 16 (1969) 147ff.

when Mani was four years old, and among whom Mani grew up.⁷⁶ Their connection with Elchasai, though disregarded or distrusted by almost all scholars, is now confirmed by the Cologne Codex.⁷⁷ This confirmation means that the various attempts to identify Mani's baptists with the anti-Jewish and anti-Christian Mandaeans who make their first *recorded* appearance some two centuries later can no longer stand;⁷⁸ for the Elchasaites of the Cologne Codex were not only rooted in traditions of definite Jewish origin, including the Sabbath, but also recognized as binding for their communal life the message of Jesus and an unknown version of the Christian Gospels. The Christian element is consistently referred to as *αἱ ἐντολαὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος*.⁷⁹ We come to realize that the relation of Manichaeism and Mandaeism was less direct and more complicated than is generally believed. There remains the remote possibility that Mani himself, or parts of the Manichaean literature such as the Psalms of Thomas, came under the influence of still another baptist sect, to be located somewhere in Babylonia or Mesopotamia and related to, or identical with, the later Mandaeans.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ The source is an-Nadim's *Fihrist* (p. 340 ed. Flügel); cf. G. Flügel (above, n. 29) 133f, W. Brandt [preceding note] 134f.

⁷⁷ CMC 94,9-11 (Mani is addressing the baptists) δείκνυαι γὰρ Ἀλχασαῖος ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῶν νόμου ὑμῶν ("Mani-Codex" 135 n. 97). The Greek form of the name in CMC is consistently spelled *Αλχασαῖος*, a spelling which contributes substantially to the clarification of the etymology of the name. The absence of an initial spirant in combination with the specific vocalization of the first syllable (*Αλ-*), which was hitherto unattested in this form, support the derivation from Syriac *alāhā kasyā* ("Hidden God") rather than from *haylā kasyā* ("Hidden Power"); δύναμις κεκαλυμμένη in Epiph. *Haer.* 19.2.2); cf. W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptisten*. Beihefe zur Zeitschr. für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 18 (Giessen 1910) 109, W. Brandt, *Elchasai* (above, n. 75) 8, K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer*, I, 233 n. 4, G. Strecker (above, n. 75) 117ff.

⁷⁸ Cf. "Mani-Codex" 133ff.

⁷⁹ CMC 79,20f, 80,11f, 84,8f, 84,20f, 91,10f, and 91,20f ("Mani-Codex" 136). Cf. the similar clash between *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* and *ἐντολὴ τοῦ θεοῦ* in Matth. 15.1ff and Mark 7.1ff.

⁸⁰ For a recent and largely novel reassessment of the *Mandäerfrage* see E. M. Yamauchi, *Gnostic Ethics and Mandaean Origins*. Harvard Theological Studies 24 (Cambridge 1970). Certain aspects of Yamauchi's approach, though stimulating, provoke disagreement, especially when he attempts to minimize direct Jewish or Jewish-Christian influence on primitive Mandaeism. The Cologne Codex seems to provide some of the very links which Yamauchi complained were missing, for instance with regard to almsgiving (above, n. 48) and the Mandaean Sunday (below, n. 97). Mani grew up in a Jewish-Christian baptist community which observed the Sabbath (below, p. 48), but he adopted the Christian Sunday and an anti-Jewish attitude. Is it so unlikely, then, to find in Mandaeism, which after all has an even more complex genealogy than

It is much easier, however, to regard the analogies between the Manichaean and Mandaean religions, which consist in parallels in the extant literatures rather than similarities in cult practices, as an independent heritage from common ancestors, namely, the Palestinian and Babylonian baptist movements which influenced Mani and which helped to produce the Mandaens (or proto-Mandaens) as their last offshoot. The problem presented by the fact that Mandaean ritual provides the only parallel for two of the ritual practices with which the baptists are credited by Mani finds its easiest solution if explained on the same lines.⁸¹ The two rites which Mani's baptists share with the Mandaens of the extant Mandaic documents are the purification of their food by ablutions with water and the ritual preparation and baking of their bread, most likely unleavened bread. In the Cologne Codex, this bread is distinguished from the wheat bread of the "Greeks," a term we shall discuss later.⁸² The first practice is comparable to the ritual cleaning of the Mandaean *Tābūtā*, the second survived in the Mandaean *Pihtā* and *Faṭirē*, two different kinds of unleavened bread prepared for sacramental use.⁸³

It is regrettable, though characteristic, that the few pages in the Cologne Codex which are devoted to the doctrines of Elchasai himself are nothing but a collection of legendary stories which add nothing substantial to the reports of the Christian heresiologists. These stories relate how water, earth, and bread address themselves to Elchasai, the righteous one (*δίκαιος*), and implore him not to do what his Babylonian followers were precisely doing when they used the water for baptism, tilled the soil and baked the bread.⁸⁴ What Mani does here is to conjure up the ghost of Elchasai and have him confute the ritual

Manichaeism, "such a devolution of this Jewish characteristic [i.e. the Sabbath] into anti-Jewish polemic" (Yamauchi, 64)?

⁸¹ Those scholars who did not plead for a direct identification of Mani's baptists with the Mandaens but regarded both as descending, *qua* baptists, from common ancestors, must be very close to the truth (e.g. O. G. von Wesendonk, *Die Lehre des Mani* [Leipzig 1922] 16f n. 3).

⁸² "Mani-Codex" 139 n. 108 and 145 n. 126; see below, nn. 107-109.

⁸³ K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* II, 124, 132, 133.

⁸⁴ CMC 94,9-97,17 (cf. "Mani-Codex" 135, 143, 146f) esp. 95,8ff σὺ δὲ φάσκων λάτρης εἶνας καὶ δίκαιος. "Righteous" (*δίκαιος*), the name of honor given to James, "the Lord's brother" (Hegesippus ap. Eus. *H.E.* 2,23,4ff; Clement of Alexandria ap. Eus. *H.E.* 2,1,4), was a genuinely Jewish-Christian term which was adopted by Mani and reserved for the Manichaean Elect (e.g. *Keph.* 36,25, 93,7, 166,3, 189,30, 192,25, 209,13; cf. A. Vööbus [above, n. 49] 112, F. C. Burkitt [above, n. 33] 46, 105f); for its Jewish background see R. Mach, *Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch* (Leiden 1957).

practices of the Babylonian Elchasaites on the basis of Manichaean pan-psychism, a clever trick which infuriated the baptists. As one would expect, the factual background of these stories is almost nil. The facts are that Elchasai was indeed called ἀνήρ δίκαιος and that he had mentioned the "voice of the water" (*φωνὴ τοῦ ὕδατος*) in his sacred book.⁸⁵ The rest is Mani's invention.

The new data on the customs of the southern Babylonian baptists, on the other hand, never openly contradict and often confirm the ancient reports on the Elchasaites and on related baptist sects of Jewish-Christians origin.⁸⁶ There are eight points of agreement which can be summarized as follows:

(1) *The ritualistic conception of piety.* All baptist sects which descended from heretic Judaism adhered to ritual practices consisting of repeated acts of external purification as the only means to attain remission of sins and as the main road to justification and salvation. Observance of the ritual laws was mandatory. These ritual laws, though different from the Mosaic law, renewed its spirit. Therefore, the baptist sects could claim to "live according to the Law" (*κατὰ νόμον ζῆν*).⁸⁷ This explains why the baptists of the Cologne Codex refer to their religion as "our law and that of the fathers in which we have been living since olden times" (*οὐ νόμος ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἐν ᾧ ἀναστρεφόμεθα ἐκ πάλαι*).⁸⁸ To emphasize the traditions of the "fathers," here certainly to be taken in the sense of forefathers and religious teachers rather than Old Testament Patriarchs, is as Jewish a heritage as the insistence on the law. The Syriac term underlying *nόμος* in the Cologne Codex is most

⁸⁵ Hipp. *Haer.* 9.13.1-2 *ταῦτην* (sc. *τὴν βίβλον*) ἀπὸ Σηρῶν τῆς Παρθίας παρειληφέναι τινὰ ἄνδρα δίκαιον Ἡλχασαῖ. *Epiph. Haer.* 19.3.7 (in a quotation from Elchasai's book of revelation) μὴ πορεύεσθε πρὸς τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ (sc. *τοῦ πυρός*), πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ ὕδατος.

⁸⁶ The classical treatment is J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J. C.-300 ap. J. C.)*. Diss. Univ. Cath. Lovan., Series II, Tom. 28 (Gembloix 1935). Several of Thomas's arguments in support of an unconditional identification of Muqātila (i.e. the Babylonian baptists as described in an-Nadim's *Fihrist*) and Mandaean (205ff, 244) and, secondly, of a derivation of the Mandaean from "une communauté baptiste elchasaisée" (252, cf. 245ff) have to undergo substantial revision in the light of the Cologne Codex.

⁸⁷ Hipp. *Haer.* 9.14.1 οὗτος (sc. Alcibiades who disseminated Elchasai's doctrines in Rome) νόμοι πολιτείαν προβάλλεται δελέασματος δίκην, φάσκων δεῖν περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ κατὰ νόμον ζῆν τοὺς πεπιστευκότας. *Ibid.* 7.34 Ἐβιωναῖοι . . . κατὰ νόμον φάσκοντες δικαιοῦσθαι. Cf. below, p. 105.

⁸⁸ CMC 91,6-9 τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦ νόμου ἡμῶν κτλ. ("Mani-Codex" 136 n. 99).

probably *nāmōsā*, a Greek loan-word. Mani adopted this term from the baptists and applied it throughout his writings primarily to the Jewish-Christian baptist sect in which he was brought up.⁸⁹

(2) *The keeping of the Sabbath.* The followers of Elchasai were required to observe the Jewish Sabbath.⁹⁰ It is almost certain that Mani's baptists did the same. The evidence, however, hinges on the interpretation one gives to a passage in the Cologne Codex where Mani describes the religion of the baptists as "the doctrines of those who are used to reading about purity, castigation of the flesh and the keeping of the resting of the hands" (*τὸ δόγμα τῶν ἀνεγνωκότων περὶ ἀγνείας καὶ σαρκοδέ[σμι]ας καὶ κατοχῆς ἀνα[πα]ύσεως τῶν χειρῶν*).⁹¹ The reference to the reading habits of the Elchasaites remains obscure. Mani probably had in mind the reading of Holy Scriptures, which preached sanctification through acts of purification and abstinence and through the "resting of the hands." This latter term is used in the Coptic *Kephalaia* to describe the elect's abstention from any kind of manual labor which was supposed to damage the "Cross of Light," i.e. the "Living Soul" or light particles which were dispersed in the world and imprisoned in each organic substance.⁹² This specifically Manichaean doctrine was, of course, unknown to the baptists. Their "resting of the hands" must have been something quite different, namely the Sabbath rest to which both the Greek *ἀνάπαυσις* and the underlying Syriac *n̄yāh*

⁸⁹ CMC, *passim*; cf. *Keph.* 44,23ff esp. 45,5, and *Hom.* 87,13–14 (in both Coptic passages *νόμος* occurs with reference to Mani's baptists, but in fragmentary context). Likewise, the Mosaic Law could be called *νόμος* (*Hom.* 11,4, 11,10; *Psalm-Book* 57,11, 192,20). The Manichaean Tradition (above, n. 8), perhaps influenced by Mani's own practice (above, n. 40), used *νόμος* also in the much broader sense of *δόγμα* to denote a non-Manichaean religion (*Keph.* 21,21; 29,35f; *Hom.* 2,27, 36,27), or *sensu eminentissimo* for the Manichaean religion itself (cf. the *testimonia* in F. C. Burkitt [above, n. 33] 53ff).

⁹⁰ Hipp. *Haer.* 9.16.3 (cf. Eus. *H.E.* 3.27 on the Ebionites). We do not know whether the baptists of the Cologne Codex shared Elchasai's preoccupation with astrology, which influenced several of his doctrines, including rest on the Sabbath.

⁹¹ CMC 102,12–16. *Σαρκοδέ[σμι]ας* as restored by Henrichs–Koenen seems to be a *hapax legomenon*; but there is no reasonable alternative, and the word makes perfect sense as it stands (cf. *Keph.* 212,28). For *κατοχή* "observance, keeping" see G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) 731 s.v. *κατέχω* A 1, and CMC 5,6f *καὶ κατέχον τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν* (said of the young Mani who claims to have observed the Manichaean "resting of the hands" while still living with the baptists).

⁹² *Keph.* 192,9f. ΠΜΤΑΝ ΝΝΩΙΧ is a literal translation of ἡ ἀνάπαυσις τῶν χειρῶν.

or *n^oyāhtā* could occasionally refer.⁹³ Such an interpretation is confirmed by Mandaic texts and throws fresh light on the origin of the Mandaean Sunday at the same time. In one passage⁹⁴ the “resting of the hands” on Sundays is criticized, clearly in an anti-Christian context, whereas elsewhere,⁹⁵ precisely in a polemic against the Jewish Sabbath, the “resting of the hands” occurs with reference to the Mandaean holiday period of Saturday night and Sunday, during which the doing of work was discouraged.⁹⁶ This inconsistency reflects the unharmonious evolution of the Mandaean religion which, though opposed to Judaism and Christianity, borrowed from both. It has long been recognized that the Mandaean Sunday combined elements of the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday in such a way that at an earlier, perhaps pre-Mandaean, stage of this evolution, the keeping of the Sabbath will have preceded the Sunday celebration, probably under the influence of a Jewish-Christian baptist sect.⁹⁷ The “keeping of the

⁹³ Cf. Lampe (above, n. 91) 115 s.v. B 4; R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus* II (Oxford 1901) 2315ff s.vv. The universal observance of the Sabbath in Jewish-Christian circles and the relatively late (post-Constantinian) recognition of the Christian Sunday as a day of rest (W. Rordorf, *Sunday. The history of the day of rest and worship in the earliest centuries of the Christian Church* [English trans., London 1968] 68, 128, 136, 154ff) rule out any connection of ἀνάπαυσις τῶν χειρῶν in *CMC* (above, n. 91) with the Christian Sunday. See Rordorf, *Sunday* 161: “The Syriac *Didascalia* [written about 250 for *Gentile* Christians] did not require any rest from work on Sunday.” The proposed interpretation of ἀνάπαυσις τῶν χειρῶν in *CMC* as distinct from the use of the same phrase in *Keph.* (see preceding note) finds support in Aug. C. *Faust.* 6.4 (CSEL 25 p. 288,22–290,24), a passage on the Manichaean rejection of the Jewish *cessatio* [= ἀνάπαυσις] *Sabbatorum* in which the Sabbath rest is compared to the daily abstention from physical activities as practised by the Manichaean Elect.

⁹⁴ *Ginza R.* 56,12 (p. 50,25 ed. M. Lidzbarski): “On Sunday they keep their hands still.”

⁹⁵ *Mand. Lit.* (Oxford Collection) p. 211,5 ed. Lidzbarski: “On the Sabbath she [i.e. Mirjai, a symbolic personification of the Mandaean religion] undertakes work, on Sunday she keeps her hands still.” Ντρ “guard, watch, keep” corresponds to *κατοχή* in *CMC* 102,15 (above, n. 91) rather than to ἀνάπαυσις in *CMC* 102,15f. The Coptic parallel (above, n. 92) forbids employing one of the panaceas of textual criticism by interpreting *κατοχῆς ἀνα[πα]ύσεως τῶν χειρῶν* as a conflation of the original text (*κατοχῆς τῶν χειρῶν*) with a gloss (*ἀνάπαυσεως*).

⁹⁶ K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* II 326ff.

⁹⁷ K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* II 327 and 330f; cf. W. Rordorf (above, n. 93) 190ff. The objection raised by Yamauchi (above, n. 80) 64, lacks a supporting argument. [After the above was written, Professor Rudolph kindly informed me that his theory of a Mandaean observance of the Sabbath-eve was in part based on the philologically untenable interpretation of the Mandaean *anpia juma* as “Vorabend des Tages” instead of the correct “Anbruch des (Sonn-)Tages” (cf. R. Macuch, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 87 [1962] 744f; K. Rudolph in H. Gese,

resting of the hands" by the southern Babylonian baptists supports such a hypothesis.

(3) *The baptisms or repeated ritual ablutions of the whole body in running water.* Their frequency and significance varied from sect to sect. Elchasai distinguished between an initiatory sacramental baptism for the remission of sins on the one hand, and repeated baths for purificatory and remedial purposes on the other.⁹⁸ The Elchasaites of the Cologne Codex are attacked by Mani because of their *daily* baths, a practice which they shared with the Ebionites and Hemerobaptists.⁹⁹ One of Mani's arguments seems to credit the Babylonian Elchasaites also with the institution of sacramental baptism for initiation as admitted by Elchasai and the Ebionites.¹⁰⁰

(4) *Celebration of the Eucharist with unleavened bread and mere water.* This practice, though not expressly attested for Elchasai, was adopted by the Ebionites and almost certainly also by Mani's baptists.¹⁰¹ Otherwise, their regulations regarding the preparation of bread would make no sense. Mani himself interpreted the ritual use of this bread clearly as sacramental and eucharistic. In refuting the bread-baking practices of his baptists, he quotes from the New Testament. Characteristically enough, he starts with the institution of the Lord's supper, which he quotes in a peculiar mixture of Matthew and Mark or Luke, another proof of Mani's use of Tatian's *Diatessaron*.¹⁰² After further quotations, Mani ends with the observation that when Jesus commis-

M. Höfner, K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. Die Religionen der Menschheit* 10,2 [Stuttgart 1970] 444 n. 186). Nevertheless the whole issue of Mandaean adaptation of, and reaction to, Jewish customs remains as open as ever; see E. Segelberg, "The Mandaean Week," *RechScRel* 60 (1972) 273–286, esp. 274, 282, and 286.]

⁹⁸ G. Strecker (above, n. 75) 1180f; K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* I 234f.

⁹⁹ CMC 82,23–83,13 ("Mani-Codex" 141 n. 116). Cf. Epiph. *Haer.* 30.2.4, 30.15.3, 30.21.1 (Ebionites), 17.1.2f (Hemerobaptists).

¹⁰⁰ CMC 83,3–7 ἀπαξ γὰρ βαπτισθέντες καὶ ἀπα[ξ] καθαρθέντες εἰνεκε[ν] τίνος πάλιν καθ' ἔκαστη[ν] ἡμέραν βαπτιζεοθε; ("Mani-Codex" 141 n. 116).

¹⁰¹ Epiph. *Haer.* 30.16; cf. J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Paris 1958) 69.

¹⁰² CMC 92,3–9 ("Mani-Codex" 136 n. 100). New evidence on Mani's use of the *Diatessaron* is forthcoming in contributions by G. Quispel (in a paper entitled "Mani et la tradition évangélique des Judéo-Chrétiens," which through the kindness of the author I was able to read in typescript) and by L. Koenen. [Professor Quispel's paper is now available in print: *RechScRel* 60 (1972) 143–150.]

sioned the Twelve, he did not order them to carry baking equipment with them, neither millstone nor oven.¹⁰³ This is an elaboration of the *μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον* in Luke and Mark.¹⁰⁴ The baptists must have been hard put to challenge this argument, unless they had followed the Jewish-Christians habit of deleting scriptural passages which run contrary to their own beliefs.

(5) *The rejection of certain parts of the Old and New Testaments, including all of St. Paul.*¹⁰⁵ The baptists of the Cologne Codex argue with Mani on the basis of the New Testament. This is the only explicit reference to their use of the Scriptures. Speculation as to which of the gospels they had adopted would, therefore, be in vain. It might have been anything from Tatian's Harmony to one of the several specifically Jewish-Christians gospels.¹⁰⁶ In this connection, we have to consider briefly the fact that in the Cologne Codex, the baptists suspect Mani of "going to the Greeks" (*εἰς τοὺς Ἑλληνας πορεύεσθαι*) or "to the Gentiles" (*εἰς θνητούς*).¹⁰⁷ One is reminded of the same words in John 7.35

¹⁰³ CMC 93,14–23 (cf. "Mani-Codex" 138 n. 104) ὁμοίως δὲ ὀπτηνίκα ὡ[πέ]στειλεν ἀντὸν τῷ[ι] μα[θητ]η[ρ]άς ὁ σω(τὴ)ρ καθ' ἔκ[αστον] τόπον κηρύξαι [οὐτε] μύλον οὔτε καλ[ιθανον] (cf. Matth. 6.30; Luke 12.28) σιγηπεφέρο[ντο μεθ'] ἐ[α]ντῶν ὡ[λα]λ' [ἡπει]γοντο πα[ρα-
σκευὴν οὐδὲ]μίαν ἐκ το[ῦ οἰκου προσ]λαμβάν[οντες].

¹⁰⁴ Luke 9.3; Mark 6.8. These scriptural passages must have inspired Mani when he specified which personal belongings his monks (i.e. the Elect) were allowed to possess (see A. Vööbus [above, n. 49] 116ff).

¹⁰⁵ Eus. *H.E.* 3.27.4 οὐτοι (sc. οἱ Ἐβιωναῖοι) δὲ τοῦ μὲν ἀποστόλου πάμπαν τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀρνητέας ἴρωντο εἴναι δεῖν, ἀποστάτην ἀποκαλοῦντες αὐτὸν τοῦ νόμου (similarly Iren. *Haer.* 1.26.2 *Paulum recusantem apostatam eum legis dicentes*); cf. "Mani-Codex" 139 n. 107. One is reminded of CMC 89,11–14, where the baptists complain to Mani's father Pattikios: ὁ νιός σου ἔξεπτάτη τοῦ νόμου ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον βούλεται πορεύθηναι.]

¹⁰⁶ P. Vielhauer, "Judenchristliche Evangelien," in Hennecke–Schneemelcher I (above, n. 22) 75–108. A new fragment of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is found in Didymus of Alexandria, *CPss.* 184,9f ed. A. Gesché and M. Gronewald (*Didymos der Blinde. Psalmenkommentar (Tura Papyrus)*, Teil III. Papyrologische Texte u. Abhandlungen 8 [Bonn 1969] 198). This attestation adds credibility to the opinion of W. Bauer and others (e.g. H. Koester in Robinson–Koester [above, n. 20] 130) that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* originated in Egypt and was written in Greek (for a different view, see G. Quispel, *Vigiliae Christianae* 11 [1957] 189–207, *New Testament Studies* 12 [1965/66] 371–382), because Didymus did not know Aramaic. (If he had used a translation into Greek, he would very likely have said so.) If so, this gospel cannot have been the one used by Mani's Syriac-speaking baptists.

¹⁰⁷ CMC 80,16–18 and 87,19–21 (texts quoted in "Mani-Codex" 139). It is obvious that τὰ θνητα as used by the baptists "has the connotation of religious and moral inferiority which was taken for granted by the Jews" (W. Bauer,

where the Jews suspect that Jesus might intend “to go to the dispersion of the Greeks and teach the Greeks.”¹⁰⁸ This is precisely what St. Paul did when he brought the Gospel to the Gentiles. The common Jewish-Christian term of abuse for St. Paul was “Greek.”¹⁰⁹ This coincidence is hardly accidental. It is more than likely that Mani had come into contact, personal and literal, with the Marcionite and Bardesanite types of Christianity when he was still living with the baptists.¹¹⁰ Both Marcion and Bardaišan, for all their differences, represented a Pauline or Greek Christianity and had nothing in common with Judaism or Jewish Chris-

W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament* [Chicago 1957] 217 s.v. ἔθνος 2).

¹⁰⁸ εἰπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑαυτούς· Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὑρίσκομεν αὐτὸν; μὴ εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορεύεσθαι καὶ διδάσκειν τὸν Ἑλληνα; (The relevance of this New Testament passage was first pointed out to us by E. de Strycker). In contrast to ‘Ἑλληνισταί’ (on which see H. J. Schoeps [above, n. 8] 5), ‘Ἑλληνες’ as used in the terminology of the LXX and the New Testament (and, by implication, in *CMC*) does not classify people according to their language, but denotes ethnic (i.e. non-Jewish) origin. Slightly different is Socrates’ definition of Manichaeism as ἐλληνίζων Χριστιανισμός (*H.E.* 1.22), which he goes on to explain as αἱ τῶν βίβλων τοίνυν ὑπόθεσεις χριστιανίζουσι μὲν τῇ φωνῇ, τοῖς δὲ δόγμασιν ἐλληνίζουσιν (Socrates refers explicitly to Pythagoras and Empedocles as sources for the Manichaean doctrine of *μεταγγιώμασ*); for Socrates ἐλληνίζειν doubtlessly meant the study of pagan authors who wrote in Greek.

¹⁰⁹ Epiph. *Haer.* 30.16.8f (cf. 30.25.1ff).

¹¹⁰ On the details of Marcion’s and Bardaišan’s influence on Mani see F. C. Burkitt in C. W. Mitchell, *S. Ephraim’s Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan* II (London and Oxford 1921) cxiif, and Burkitt (above, n. 33) 14, 74–85 (esp. 74: “Greek influence . . . will have come to Mani *through a Syriac channel*” [italics mine]); H. H. Schaeder, “Urförm und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems,” *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 1924–25 (Leipzig–Berlin 1927) 73ff (= *Studien zur orientalischen Religionsgeschichte* [Darmstadt 1968] 23ff); O. G. von Wesendonk, “Bardesanes und Mani,” *Acta Orientalia* 10 (1932) 336–363; H.-Ch. Puech in *Annales du Collège de France* 56 (1956) 204ff; A. Böhlig (above, n. 2) 208ff and 243; O. Klíma (above, n. 1) 127ff; H. J. W. Drijvers, *Bardaišan of Edessa* (Assen 1966) 225ff; P. Brown, “The diffusion of Manichaeism” (above, n. 33) 93 (= *Religion and Society* [ibid.] 97). The intriguing question whether or not Bardaišan was a “Gnostic” who turned “Christian,” which is answered in the affirmative by Christian heresiologists, need not concern us here. Attention should be drawn, however, to a note in a recent text of Didymus the Blind (*CPss.* 181,8ff [above, n. 106]), where Bardaišan is said to have converted from Valentinianism to orthodox Christianity (cf. Eus. *H.E.* 4.30.3) and to have become a presbyter later. (This latter detail anticipates a remark to the same effect in Theodore bar Kōnai; cf. S. P. Brock, *JEgArch* 57 [1971] 241, and *JTheolStud* n.s. 22 [1971] 530f.) The attempt by J. Pedersen, rightly rejected by H. J. W. Drijvers (*Bardaišan* 42), to establish artificial links between the Bardesanites and an-Nadim’s Muğtasila is implicitly proved wrong by the evidence of the Cologne Codex.

tianity. Marcion was emphatically anti-Jewish in his rejection of the Old Testament and its god; Bardaišan was passionately pro-Greek in his successful attempt to imbue Christian theology with Greek philosophy. Mani was indebted to both of them,¹¹¹ and it is hardly wrong to imagine a Mani who, when still with the baptists, tried hard to get hold of their forbidden books. If the baptists had an index of prohibited books, Marcion and Bardaišan must have been given pride of place. It is understandable, therefore, that the Jewish-Christian Elchasaites of southern Babylonia associated Mani's more spiritual religiosity with the Greeks whom they hated.

(6) *Encratism*. Abstention from meat is attested for the Ebionites but not for the Elchasaites.¹¹² The baptists of the Cologne Codex were confirmed vegetarians.¹¹³ The asceticism which they profess was apparently far more rigid than that of any known Jewish-Christian sect. This brings us to the question of continence. The Cologne Codex does not speak of women in connection with these baptists. Shortly before he joined them, Mani's father was admonished by a mysterious voice to eat no meat, drink no wine, and abstain from women.¹¹⁴ It is likely, therefore, that

¹¹¹ The conclusion is inescapable that the fragmentary passage *Keph.* 13,30f ("At this particular time, in the last Church [sc. before the coming of Mani], a righteous [δίκαιος] and honest [ΡΜΜΜΗΕ = ἀληθώώς] man who belonged to the Kingdom made his appearance. He met with . . ." [or "agreed with . . ."]), which is part of a chronological catalogue of Mani's predecessors (above, n. 6), is an anonymous reference to both Marcion and Bardaišan, as was first suggested by H. J. Polotsky; cf. H.-Ch. Puech in *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 4 (1936) 271 (= *The Mystic Vision* [above, n. 7] 304). It is attested in the *Fihrist* (cf. Kessler [above, n. 34] 192; Adam [above, n. 23] 8f) that three chapters in Mani's *Book of the Mysteries* dealt with Bardesaneite theology. For a conjectural instance of Mani's dependence on Bardaišan see below, n. 135.

¹¹² W. Brandt, *Elchasai* (above, n. 75) 111–115; G. Strecker, *RAC* 4 (1959) 1182 (cf. "Mani-Codex" 149 n. 137). Add the vegetarian tendencies found in the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (P. Vielhauer in Hennecke–Schneemelcher I [above, n. 22] 102, 104).

¹¹³ Cf. "Mani-Codex" 145ff.

¹¹⁴ *Fihrist* p. 328 ed. Flügel (cf. Kessler [above, n. 34] 384; Adam [above, n. 23] 24). The close Manichaean parallel in M 2 V I 8–10 (in Andreas–Henning [above, n. 23] 304, with Henning's n. 5) does not permit us to dismiss this admonition as a later Manichaean fabrication; rather it confirms Mani's indebtedness to the encratitic ethical code of the Mugtasila (rightly emphasized by G. Flügel [above, n. 29] 136, 140, 142; O. Klma [above, n. 1] 218f; J. Thomas [above, n. 86] 207 "Les Moughtaslas d'An-Nadim sont des continents parfaits."). G. Widengren, who tried to identify Mani's baptists with the Mandaean (above, p. 45), found it difficult to reconcile this command to lead

Mani grew up in an exclusively male community, an assumption which would account for his total opposition toward sexuality. If so, their continuous continence was an ideal which was as foreign to all the other baptist sects as it was to Judaism or, for that matter, Mandaeism. Elchasai even encouraged marriage.¹¹⁵ But if we can trust Josephus, some Essenes lived without women and adopted little children to raise them in their religion, a fate similar to that of Mani.¹¹⁶ The references to marriage in the Qumran texts, however, are controversial.¹¹⁷

(7) *The doctrine of the “True Prophet.”* The Pseudo-Clementines and Elchasai coincide in that they propagate the cyclic incarnation of the True Prophet.¹¹⁸ For Elchasai, however, the series of incarnations did not culminate in Christ, but included Elchasai and continued even beyond him. The Cologne Codex has a clear reference to this doctrine. Some of the baptists were so impressed by Mani’s performance as a

an ascetic life with the nonascetic habits of the Mandaeans (*Mani and Manichaeism* [English trans., New York 1965] 25).

¹¹⁵ Epiph. *Haer.* 19.1.7 ἀπεχθάνεται δὲ τῇ παρθενίᾳ, μισεῖ δὲ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἀναγκάζει δὲ γάμον. Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche* I (4th ed., Berlin 1961) 195.

¹¹⁶ Joseph. *BJ* 2.8.2 [120] (cf. *ibid.* 2.8.13 [160f], and *AJ* 18.21) καὶ γάμον μὲν παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὑπεροφία, τοὺς δὲ ἀλλοτρίους παιδάς ἐκλαμβάνοντες ἀπαλούς ἔτι πρὸς τὰ μαζήματα συγγενεῖς ἥγοντας καὶ τοὺς θέσεων αὐτῶν ἐντυποῦνοι (cf. CMC 90, 11–18, where the synod of the baptists reminds Mani of what they believed was his former observance of the baptist faith: ἐκ νεότητος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὑπάρχων καλῶς διῆγες ἐν τε ταῖς τάξεις [σ]ιν καὶ ἀναστροφαῖς [τ]οῦ νόμου ἡμῶν. ὡς [νῦν] μόφη κατεσταλμένη [νη] ὑπῆρχες ἐμ μέσων [ἡμ]ῶν). H. R. Moehring, “Josephus on the marriage customs of the Essenes,” in A. Wikgren (ed.), *Early Christian Origins* (Chicago 1961) 120–127 is a poor example of applied form-criticism.

¹¹⁷ F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City N.Y., 1958) 71ff; J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer* II (München–Basel 1960) 10f; E. M. Yamauchi (above, no. 80) 59; A. Guillaumont, “A propos du célibat des Esséniens,” in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris 1971) 395–404.

¹¹⁸ “Mani-Codex” 139 and 159. Cf. W. Brandt, *Jüd. Baptismen* (above, n. 77) 92; W. Brandt, *Elchasai* (above, n. 75) 79–85; H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie u. Geschichte des Jüdenchristentums* (Tübingen 1949) 327f, 335ff; H.-Ch. Puech (above, n. 31) 144f n. 241; H. J. Schoeps (above, n. 8) 25f; K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* I 158 n. 1, and in *Koptologische Studien* (above, n. 29) 175; W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (Göttingen 1956) 130f. G. Widengren, *The Great Vohu Manah and the Apostle of God*. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1945: 5, 64ff esp. 66 prefers to interpret the Manichaean “doctrine of cyclic revelation as an Iranian theologoumenon,” and postulates “an ancient Indo-Iranian dogma of revelation as the real background of the doctrine of Mani in this case” (cf. W. Brandt [above, n. 75] 85).

theologian that they regarded him as the True Prophet and the incarnation of the Living Logos.¹¹⁹ This doctrine, which lies at the root of Mani's own conception of his apostleship as the concluding stage in a series of incarnations, forms, in combination with the docetism of Marcion and Bardaişan, the basis of Mani's christology.¹²⁰

(8) The baptists of the Cologne Codex believed in the resurrection of the body, which they conceived of as a "resting of the garment" (*ἀνάπαυσις τοῦ ἐδύματος*).¹²¹ They shared this belief with orthodox Judaism and Jewish-Christianity.¹²²

These parallels are overwhelming. Henceforth, the fact that Mani grew up in, and was influenced by, Jewish-Christian baptists must be reckoned with. This new insight into the religious environment in which Mani had lived for twenty years is quite a revelation in its own right and will provide fertile soil for future studies.

And yet the early history of Mani's baptists is totally in the dark. The moment we consider their origin, we indulge in speculation, a tendency which has proved particularly dangerous in these studies. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the Elchasaiter connections of the Babylonian baptists may be secondary and superimposed, perhaps through the adoption of Elchasai's book of revelation, on an original Palestinian substratum. Two factors support such a hypothesis. In the

¹¹⁹ *CMC* 86, 1-9 τινὲς δὲ ἔξι αὐτῶν εἰχόν με ὡσεὶ προφήτην καὶ διδάσκαλον. καὶ τινὲς μὲν ἔξι αὐτῶν ἐλεγον· ζῶν λόγος (1 Petr. 1,23; Hebr. 4,12; G. W. H. Lampe [above, n. 91] s.v. λόγος II.B.6; but λόγια ζῶντα Acts 7,38) ἀδεῖται (cf. Philo, *Sacr. Abel.* 1,31 ἀδεῖται δὲ τις καὶ τοιούτος ἐν ἀπορρήτοις λόγος) ἐν αὐτῶν· ποιήσωμεν αὐτὸν διδάσκαλον τοῦ δόγματος ήμῶν." Cf. *CMC* 86, 17-87,6 (quoted in "Mani-Codex" 142 n. 118).

¹²⁰ *Keph.* 12,9-27; *PG* I, 1461 C, 1464 D, 1465 A (see A. Adam [above, n. 23] 97ff). Cf. F. C. Burkitt (above, n. 33) 38ff; E. Waldschmidt und W. Lentz, "Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus," *Abh. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.* 1926, IV; H.-Ch. Puech, "La Gnose et le temps" (above, n. 61) 107f. The study of J. Ries (above, n. 57) is confined to some titles of Christ as used in Manichaean texts. Cf. E. Rose, *Die Christologie des Manichäismus*. Theol. Diss. Marburg 1941 (*non vidi*).

¹²¹ *CMC* 87,5f. ("Mani-Codex" 142). *Ανάπαυσις* is opposed to *κόλασις* *CMC* 43,2f; cf. P. Vielhauer, "ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΣ. Zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums," *Festschrift E. Haenchen*. Beiheft z. *ZNW*, 30 (Berlin 1964) 281-299. On *ἔνδυμα* see below, nn. 128 and 133.

¹²² Pertinent references are scattered throughout Jewish and Jewish-Christian apocalyptic texts, in which eschatology and apocalyptic are closely interwoven; cf. J. Daniélou (above, n. 101) 342ff, J. Kroll, *Gott und Hölle*. Studien d. Bibliothek Warburg, 20 (Leipzig-Berlin 1932) 35ff. Characteristically, we find the same combination of eschatology and apocalyptic in *CMC* 86,17-87,6 ("Mani-Codex" 142 n. 118).

first place, there is strong evidence for missionary activities of Elchasaites groups, in the late second and early third centuries, in places as different as Coele Syria (Apameia), Rome, and Palestine.¹²³ It is conceivable, therefore, that another wave of this missionary tide reached southern Babylonia and mingled with existing currents, thus producing the special blend of Mani's baptists. In the second place, Mani's baptists led a communal life in isolated villages and emphasized manual labor, especially agriculture.¹²⁴ There is no recorded precedent for such a form of organization in Jewish-Christian sects. But there are the Essenes and the Qumran sect of Palestine which provide analogies.¹²⁵

VII

Mani's opening speech in the theological disputation which preceded the violent breach with the Babylonian baptists is a brief but brilliant exposition of the fundamental difference between the two.¹²⁶ The body, Mani argues, is as defiled as the matter of which it is created. Whether the food is baptized or not, its effect on the body is the same in that it produces blood, gall, evil spirits, dregs (*τρύξ*),¹²⁷ excrements of shame (*σκύβαλα τῆς αἰσχύνης*),¹²⁸ and all the defilement of the body.

¹²³ Cf. G. Strecker (above, n. 112) 1173f.

¹²⁴ Cf. "Mani-Codex" 146ff. Most revealing is *CMC* 106,15-19 ("Mani-Codex" 131 n. 84), where two baptists who converted and followed Mani are called by Mani *πλη[σιόχω]ροι μον.* Taken at face value, the term means that the two occupied the piece of land next to Mani's.

¹²⁵ Philo, *Quod omnis probus* 76; Philo ap. Eus. *P.E.* 8.11.8. Philo points out that some of the Essenes attended to occupations other than agriculture which were of a more workmanlike character. This was natural for such communities, which kept aloof from their heathen neighbors as much as possible and tended to be self-supporting. However, commerce with nonbelievers was permitted on a small scale; cf. e.g. *Dam.* XII 7-11, XIII 14f for the Qumran sect, *CMC* 97,18ff (quoted at "Mani-Codex" 148 n. 132) for the baptists.

¹²⁶ *CMC* 80,22-85,12 (cf. "Mani-Codex" nn. 16, 103, 105, 116, 124, 204).

¹²⁷ *CMC* 81,8-13 φάνεται ἡμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἔξ αὐτῆς (sc. τῆς ἐδωδῆς τῆς ἡδη βεβαπισμένης) γίνεται αἷμα καὶ χολὴ καὶ πν[εύμ]ατα καὶ σκύβαλα τῆς αἰσχύνης καὶ τοῦ σώματος μιαρότης. *CMC* 82,13-18 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ βδελυρότης καὶ ἡ τρύξ τῶν ἀμφ[τέρων] (sc. baptized and unbaptized food) θεωρεῖται μη[δέ]ν παραλάττουσα ἔκα[τε]ρας. On τρύξ (ΣΑΡΜΕ in the Manichaean Coptic) see *Keph.* 15,10, 121,6, 121,25-32, 133,2, 215,14ff, 223,29.

¹²⁸ See preceding note. Cf. *CMC* 81,18ff πάντα τὰ ἀπεκδ[ύμα]τα (*voix nova*) τῆς αἰσχύνης καὶ αἱ βδελυρότητος for the refuse of the body (for the reverse process of "putting on" the garment of the body, see *CMC* 22,9-13 ["Mani-Codex" 179 n. 207] πρὶν ἐνδύσωμαι τὸ ὄργανον [cf. G. W. H. Lampe (above, n. 91) 969 s.v. 5; and Syriac *mānā* which means both ὄργανον and ἐνδύμα] τόδε καὶ πρὶν πλανηθῶ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ταύτη τῇ βδελυρώδει). A likely model for the phrase ἀπεκδύματα

The activity of this disgusting garbage producer can be reduced only through abstention from food in fasting. The daily baptisms are equally useless. In fact, they attest to a daily defilement of the body. Otherwise, one baptism would do once and for all. Purification of the body is impossible because of the secretion of the faeces (*διὰ τὰς ἐκκρίσεις τῆς υποστάθμης*),¹²⁹ which keeps the body in constant motion. The only true purity is that through Gnosis: Separation of Light from Darkness and salvation of the soul from death according to the precepts of the Lord.¹³⁰ The baptists, however, departed from this conception of purity when they adopted the purification of the body which was originally created in loathesomeness and is procreated in a process comparable to cheese-making (*ἐτυρώθη*).¹³¹

This is Mani's answer, full of borrowings from the Greek spiritualists. The comparison of impregnation by the semen to the curdling of milk is part of the terminology of Aristotelian embryology and was used by the Alexandrian school of biblical exegesis to interpret a passage in Job.¹³² Closely associated with this passage is the interpretation of the

τῆς αἰσχύνης is the encratitic *Gospel of the Egyptians* as quoted by Julius Cassianus ap. Clem. *Str.* 3.13.92 (= *Apocrypha* II, ed. E. Klostermann [3rd ed., Berlin 1929] fr. 2; Hennecke-Schneemelcher I [above, n. 22] 111, 115, 215): *ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε κτλ.* The underlying concept is the Alexandrian exegesis of Gen. 3.21 *χιτῶνας δερματίνους* (cf. Gen. 2.25) as the material body (Julius Cassianus ap. Clem. *Str.* 3.95.2); see below, n. 133, and G. Quispel in *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo. Supplements to Numen*, 12 (Leiden 1970) 633ff. The positive correlation to *τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα* is "garment of glory (or light)" as a designation for Adam's state before the fall; e.g. A. F. J. Klijn, *JBL* 81 (1962) 273f, J. Z. Smith, *History of Religions* 5 (1966) 231f.

¹²⁹ CMC 84,5f ("Mani-Codex" 104 n. 16).

¹³⁰ CMC 84,9-17 ("Mani-Codex" 137 n. 103). Cf. *Evangelium Veritatis* p. 25,12-19, one of the key passages in this Valentinian text (see H. Jonas, *Gnomon* 32 [1960] 335, and above, n. 28).

¹³¹ CMC 85,6-12 καὶ κατέσχατε τὴν τοῦ σώματος κάθαρσον τοῦ μαρωτάτου καὶ διὰ μυσαρότροπος πεπλασμένου. καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἐτυρώθη (see following note) καὶ οἰκοδομηθὲν ἐστη (cf. *Keph.* 95,11-15; 130,26). The abominable nature of both man's creation and procreation was a heretical commonplace according to Tert. *De resurr.* 4 (CCL 2 p. 925,3-7) *an aliud prius vel magis audias ab haeretico quam ab ethnico et non protinus et non ubique convicium carnis, in originem, in materiam, in casum, in omnem exitum eius, inmundae a primordio ex faecibus* (below, n. 134) *terrae, inmundioris deinceps ex seminis sui limo.*

¹³² Job 10.10. Cf. Didymus of Alexandria's *Cjob* 276,29ff ed. U. Hagedorn, D. Hagedorn, and L. Koenen (*Didymos der Blinde. Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura Papirus)*, Teil III. Papyrologische Texte u. Abhandlungen 3 [Bonn 1968]), with the editors' notes). Three centuries after Mani, Burzōē, the private physician of Chosroes I, was still familiar with Aristotelian embryology; cf. the passage quoted in G. Widengren, *Iranische Geisteswelt* (Baden-Baden 1961) 103.

“garments of skin” in Genesis as the mortal body of flesh, an image with which Mani was fully familiar.¹³³ The terms *σκύβαλον*, *τρύξ*, and *ὑποστάθμη* were favorites with the Neoplatonists for the least valuable part of matter.¹³⁴ Mani must have found this Greek terminology in Bardaisan. Bardaisan used the term “dregs” frequently to denote the primordial matter, although he valued matter so much more highly than Mani that he “regarded conception and birth as a form of purification.”¹³⁵

The Elchasaites, it has been remarked, were pre-Manichaean Manichees.¹³⁶ The Cologne Codex shows what the truth of this statement is. Much in Manichaeism can now be explained as the continuation or adaptation of Elchasaiter ritual or theology. But at the same time, the Cologne Codex makes us aware of the tremendous difference in their respective conceptions of purity. The baptists believed in external ablutions and vegetarian diet as means of individual purification; their final aim was the purification and salvation of the body. For Mani, purification was a cosmic process, the separation of spirit and matter in which man as a microcosmos participated.¹³⁷ The soul was light and could be purified until it reached salvation, the body, as matter, was part of the residue that remained after the purification of light and

¹³³ See above, nn. 121 and 128. Cf. e.g. E. R. Dodds, *Proclus: The Elements of Theology* (2nd ed., Oxford 1963) 306ff; R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (London 1962) Index s.v. “Clothing.”

¹³⁴ E.g. Plato *Phaed.* 109 C (ὑποστάθμη); Julian. *Or.* 8 (5).170 D (καὶ σκύβαλον καὶ τῶν ὄντων . . . ἀποκάθαρμα καὶ τρίγα καὶ ὑποστάθμηρ); Chaldaean Oracle (fr. 158 Des Places) ap. Syne. *Insomn.* 140 C (τὸ τῆς ὑλῆς σκύβαλον). Cf. H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy. Recherches d'Archéologie, de Philologie et d'Histoire* 13 (Le Caire 1956) 213, 276f, 383–385, 392; O. Geudtner, *Die Seelenlehre der chaldäischen Orakel. Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 35 (Meisenheim 1971) 15 and 22.

¹³⁵ H. J. W. Drijvers (above, n. 110) 110, 152, 221, 226. The Syriac term for dregs, sediment, and refuse is *tefrā*; see e.g. Bardaisan ap. Ephraem, *Stanzas against Bardaisan*, II p. 143, 6–9, ed. C. W. Mitchell, *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations* (above, n. 110): “that the dregs run downward, and the fine material upward” (trans. A. A. Bevan and F. C. Burkitt in Mitchell, *S. Ephraim*, lxvi; cf. Mitchell's Index verborum *ibid.* II p. clxxxii s.v.).

¹³⁶ Kessler, *Mani* (above, n. 34) 8 n. 3. Kessler's striking phrase was presumably occasioned by the ascetic tendencies (above, n. 114) and the strange “botanical” dualism (Flügel [above, n. 29] 133f) which are ascribed to the Elchasaiter Muğtasila (i.e. Mani's baptists) in an-Nadim's *Fihrist*.

¹³⁷ On man as microcosm see *Keph.* 90, 21ff and 169, 24–175, 24 (cf. O. G. von Wesendonk [above, n. 81] 32 n. 1). In a Manichaean cosmogony the human body is said to be created “from the dirt of the male demons and the faeces of the female demons” (W. B. Henning, *NGWG* 1932, 217; cf. A. Vööbus [above, n. 49] 110f).

was thus doomed to damnation. The clash between these diametrically opposed conceptions was unavoidable, and the extant report on the final confrontation is a truly historical document.

Let me conclude on a somber note which reflects my personal experience with these texts. Written records are the raw material of past history, especially for the modern historian who would be at a loss without them. But in the field of ancient religious beliefs and movements, perhaps more than anywhere else, the very lack of sufficient documentation tends to call forth a rather disproportionate amount of scholarly activity, doubtless nourished by the tacit conviction that when we deal with *Geistesgeschichte*, certain invariable features of the human condition entitle us to substitute assumptions for recorded facts. What usually comes up in the rear of such forced advances into unknown territory is a large array of conflicting theories, from which scholars choose or to which they add, according to their likes and dislikes. Unmapped areas in the history of the human mind thus become the training ground for our imagination, and rightly so, as long as there are neither reliable roads nor signs to follow. With every piece of new evidence, however, an increasing sense of direction develops. Thus many a long vagary has come to an unexpected end after the discovery of major documents which opened new vistas. But it would be impossible to think of any written text which has come down to us, however well preserved and rich in information, that has solved all our problems. The triumphant feeling which great finds inspire, more often than not, gives way to a more disenchanted attitude when we come to realize that ignorance is the toll of historical truth and that behind each foothold in newly gained terrain, looms an abyss of nowhere. After we have pitched our camp in the new location, we are once more left with conjecture and imagination as our only guides.¹³⁸

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

¹³⁸ I should like to thank my Berkeley colleagues, Fr. Michael Guinan, Professors P. J. Alexander, J. M. Dillon, Martin Schwartz, and Wilhelm Wuellner, for valuable suggestions; my Cologne "Twin" Professor L. Koenen for constant consultation; M. L. Weber for editorial assistance; and Professors G. M. Browne of Harvard University and K. Rudolph of Karl-Marx-Universität at Leipzig for reading and improving the final typescript of this paper.